



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Yen. 27. 48
23

Yen. 48
23

THE BRITISH
HARBINGER:

DEVOTED TO

CHRISTIANITY AS IT WAS IN THE BEGINNING,
AND TO THE DEFENCE AND PROMULGATION OF
BIBLICAL TRUTH.

VOL. XXIII. FIFTH SERIES.



"Hold fast the form of sound words." *1 Pet.*

LONDON :
ARTHUR HALL AND CO., 25, PATERNOSTER ROW.
1870.

BIRMINGHAM :
MOODY BROTHERS, PRINTERS, CANNON STREET.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Address by C. Abercrombie ...	282	David, The Tabernacle of, 13, 15, 50, 52	
Age of Man, The ...	107	Debate, Holyoake v. Bradlaugh... ..	177
Albert Barnes on Creeds ...	94	Debate, King v. Bradlaugh, 288, 323, 388, 412	
A. Campbell, Memoirs of ...	96, 163	Decadence of Christianity, The... ..	141
Annual Meeting Returns ...	247	Diary, Kitty's, A leaf from	33
Annual General Meeting ...	311	Dikaosune	168
Annual Meeting and the Press ...	317	Divinity of Christ	97
Answers and Queries ...	26, 64, 173	Doctrine of Balaam, The	119
Arrival of W. Hindle ...	287	Doctrine of Scripture as to the relation of	
Australia and the Editor's Letters ...	242	Baptism and Remission of Sins ...	181, 217
Australian Statistics ...	287	Duration and nature of Future Punishment	344
Baptismal Regeneration... ..	23	Earnest Entreaty, The	359
Baptism and the Remission of Sins 181, 217		Ecce Homo	271
Baptizo, in the Hellenistic or New Testam-		Ecclesiastical Observer, The	361
ent Dialect	255, 299	Editorial	36, 380
Baptism with the Holy Ghost and with		Editor, Lectures by the	127
Fire	342	Editor and H. S. Earl, The	163, 248
Baptist Union, The	378	Editor's Letters, Australia and The ...	242
Beauty, God a Lover of	358	Education, The Training Element in ...	355
Beginning at Once	216	English Bible, The Revision of 92, 211, 246	
Benjamin Franklin	353	Enemies	359
Bible in China	29	Eureka College	365
Bible Lesson Songs for Children ...	58	Evangelist for Melbourne, An	67
Bible, English, The Revision of 92, 211, 246		Evangelization of Italy	426
Bible, and the Sects, India	169	Ever with the Lord	407
Bible College in Australia	238	Evidences of Religion	424
Bible Triumphant, The	251	Exegetical Items	98
Bible Translation in France	399	Faith and Love	338
Bradlaugh on D. King	180	Fallen Tabernacle of David Restored, The	13
Brevities	36, 85	Farewell Meeting, W. Hindle	138
By and Bye	121	Few Thoughts, A	138
Causes of error in the Interpretation of		Flaw Hunters	392
the Bible	145	Fog	22
Census (Church designation) 57, 202, 244, 279		France and Italy—the War and the Pope	362
Census, Why Nonconformists objected to		Franklin's Mode of Lending Money, Dr.	393
the	391	Future Punishment, The Duration and	
Chapel Building... ..	63	Nature of	344
Chariot of God, The	340	Generosity	66
Changes—To our Readers	397	Gethsemane	89
China, Bible in	29	Getting Right	95
Christian Union, Report on	28	God's Gifts	12
Christ at a Marriage	82	God's Thoughts and Man's Thoughts ...	119
Christianity v. Secularism	100	God in Providence	339
Christ at the Well of Samaria	198	God a Lover of Beauty	358
Christian's Hope, The	252	Golden Side, The	322
Christian Nation? What is a	335	Gone down in the "Cambria"	421
Church of Christ, Ministry in, 3, 37, 76, 110		Greediness for our Offspring	35
147, 195, 223, 263, 296, 331, 420.		Happy Home	393
City of God, The	302	Higher Pantheism, The... ..	159
Clergy Mutual Insurance League ...	240	History, Jesus the Christ in	5
Colleges, Minister making, &c... ..	352	Hymn Book, The New—Praying to the	
Common Errors in Religion	109	Spirit	30
Communion Muddle	59	Hold Thou me up	176
Communion—The difference	90	Holyoake and Bradlaugh Debate, The ...	177
Communion, Restricted... ..	353	How can we know?	262
Conventional study of the Scriptures ...	118	How shall the Church be Designated, 57,	
Co-operative Meeting, Scotland ...	285	202, 244, 279.	
Creed of the Church, The	73	Idolatry in Manchester	380
Cup and the Spring, The	69	I have only Lost One	250

	PAGE		PAGE
Interpretation of the Bible, Causes of error in	145	Poetry ... 49, 108, 144, 176, 271, 322, 393	
Inheritance, The reserved	231	Praying to the Spirit	30
India, the Bible, and the Sects	169	Prayer Meetings Union	116
Infallibility Trouble	371	Prevailing Prayer	214
Incarnation, The reality of the	190	Primary Question, A	189
In whom shall we Trust?	207	Queries and Answers	26, 64, 173
Is a Man responsible for his Belief?	333	Queries, Testing of Landmarks	27
Is the Religion of the Age Apostolic?	318	Reality of the Incarnation	190
Items of News, 30, 67, 102, 137, 173, 213, 248		Removed to where there is no Church	24, 67, 97
288, 354, 393, 426		Religion, Common error in	109
Jesus the Christ in History	5	Religions, Their Tendency to Decay	253
Knocks and Love-Taps	166	Repining and Repenting	212
Landmarks, Testing of, Queries on	27	Report on Christian Union	28
Leaf from Kitty's Diary	33	Reserved Inheritance, The	231
Lectures by the Editor	127	Restricted Communion	353
Letter from W. Hindle	98	Roman Plébisité, The	364
Letter from Mrs. Campbell	171, 303	Scientific Meeting Notice of	381
Letter from Australia	172	Scotland, Co-operation Meeting	285
Let no Envyings be	321	Seasonable Reproof	252
Life of Elder John Smith	275, 307	Secularism	100, 144, 349, 422
Life of Love, The	329	Secularism, in Darwin	65
Line of Revelation, and a page of History, A	289	Servant of Christ, A	325
Little Hungry Minds	321	Shadows on the Wall	235
Living Water, The	153	Something worth Knowing	71
Loveliness	380	Speaking the Truth in Love	12
Man's thoughts, and God's thoughts	119	Speech which the Pope should have Delivered	112
Man of Sin Identified, The	123	Sphinx and Bradlaugh, The	317
Marriage, Christ at a	83	Startling Example, A	105
Marriage Maxims	322	State Church and Disestablishment, 375, 405	
Married? Where shall I be	351	Stop and Think	108
Melbourne, An Evangelist for	67	Study of the Scriptures, Conventional	118
Methodism in Trouble	390	Sunday Dinner, That	237
Ministry in the Church of Christ 3, 37, 76, 110, 147, 195, 223, 263, 296, 331, 420		Sweeping and Dusting	358
Minister Making—Colleges, &c.	352	Tabernacle of David Restored	13, 52
Mother? Do you say your prayers	174	Tabernacle of David	15, 50
Mourning, Wearing	139	Tact	35
Muddle, Communion	59	Teaching of Experience	161
Music and Worship, Idolatry in Manchester	380	That I may know Him	259
Nazarites of Hungary	417	The Tauchnitz New Testament	99
Nearer Heaven	216	The Truth, and the Life, and The Way, 49	
Neatness and Order	140	Thoughts for the Thoughtful	394
New Hymn Book, The	30	Training Element in Education	355
New Testament, The Tauchnitz	99	Truth in Love, Speaking the	12
New Testament in its Completeness 237, 277		Union Prayer Meetings	116
Nonconformists Objected to the Census? Why	391	Unitarianism an Outpost of Infidelity 131, 205	
No Word for Jesus	215	Unity, Organic	41
Obituary 33, 69, 104, 138, 174, 214, 249, 324, 355, 396, 428.		Want of the Age, The	274
Observer Ecclesiastical, The	331	Wales, Evangelistic Co-operation for	135
Old Cooper Shop, The	132	War and the Pope, The	362
Old Story, An	410	Watch and Pray	341
Onward	1	Way, The, the Truth and the Life	49
Organic Unity	41	Wearing Mourning	139
Ornament of a Meek and Quiet Spirit 269		What is Truth?	169
Our Offspring, Greediness for	35	What will they say?	249
Page of History and a line of Revelation, A 289		What is a Christian Nation?	335
Pædobaptist Guide, or Mode and Subject 23		Where shall I be Married?	354
Pantheism, the Higher	159	William Haverly	106
Paul and Ananias	25	Wonders of the Atmosphere	320
Paul at Mar's Hill	211	Wonderful Transformation	339
Personal Religion	403	Words from the Work Table, 9, 46, 86, 155	
Plain Words	301	Words we Speak, The	357
		Year of Christ's Birth, The	272
		Young Martyrs, The	175
		Your Conscience and Mine	209

The British Harbinger.

ONWARD.

ANOTHER wave of the ocean of time has rolled past and is gone for ever. Thus wave after wave breaks upon the shore of eternity. Soon, comparatively, it will be said, "Time shall no longer intervene"—the present age shall close. Still the little while which remains may be long in compare with man's brief day. But to each there is a solemn termination of time immediately near. What are ten, twenty, forty, sixty years? How many of us will have finished our work, or have left it for ever undone, in even the first of these terms? The Lord only knows. Yet certain it is that some who write for or read the pages of this serial will be of that number. Even to those who have no dark dread of death, the thought of life's closing hour comes with deeply solemn tread. The password, "All is well," so far as it relates to treasure in heaven, may be upon the lip and in the heart and pronounced true by the angels of God. But how few, even of these favoured ones, can fall into their last, long, sleep without deep regret on account of things left undone! Neglected opportunities for personal advancement in the divine life and for labour for Christ and man start into view—it may be like billows, intent upon tearing our anchor from its hold within the veil. Let us then strive to do, each day and with all our might, whatsoever of good our hands can find to do, that thus regrets in life's closing hour may be as few as possible!

Reader! Have you maintained your steadfastness during the past year, and do you still number with those whose faces are Zion-ward? If so, then *happy* are you!

How many who began life's race with us are drooping by the way, losing themselves in darkness one by one—from the glad goal departing wide astray?

Watch then and be sober! Let your lives be onward and upward, in the best sense.

Stand up! stand up for Jesus!
The strife will not be long;
This day the noise of battle,
The next the victor's song.

To the Churches we send greeting. Beloved! how does the work of the Lord prosper in your hands? Hard ground around you? No doubt of it. But still there are some honest hearts. Seek them with increased earnestness and pray the Lord of the harvest and you will realize that they who seek shall find and they who ask shall have. Any progress the last year? If not, why not? And if but little, why not more? Is all right within? The world needs more to awaken it than a cold formal attention to ordinances. If the Church attain but little more than this, certainly good fruit will not be gathered. ONWARD is also the word in this particular. Present your bodies a living sacrifice, and this year will yield more satisfactory results than the last. Some advance has no doubt been made by the Churches generally, but not what should have been. Ponder the seven epistles to the Churches of Asia, and be wise. THE TRUTH IS ONWARD in its march upon the world. The last year is big with events of progress. The Papacy has continued to lose ground in Italy, Austria, Spain, and France; and, by its mock Œcumenical Council, hastens its overthrow. In our land, truth, justice, and right, have triumphed in the disestablishment of a part of the State Church. In Ireland the Church is free; the like work remains to be done for England, Scotland, and Wales. It will not wait long. Hardly a month runs out without some manifest advance. The State Church itself bids fair to demand its freedom, even before the forces outside are fairly gathered to the conflict. Churchmen tell us that the severance *must* come, and while many of them are resigned to the inevitable, not a few are moving into the region of desire. Dean Alford, on "The Church of the future," speaks of disestablishment thus—

"The most ardent friends of the Church might believe that she is rather hampered than aided by State Establishment; might feel with regard to their own Church that which most of us feel respecting another, that the temporal power is a hindrance and not a help. But we are not called on to come to any abstract determination. Were State Establishment all the blessing which its advocates maintain that it is, our position would be the same in this matter; for State Establishment is foredoomed. There is no need, in that which we have to say, that we should express, or even imply, our views on the abstract question. We deal with the course of facts; we draw inferences from the unfolding of history."

A NEW EDUCATIONAL ERA is upon us. The nation is awakening. Every child shall be so provided for that, at least, he shall be able to read the Bible if he will. This must ere long remodel our Sunday Schools. We shall gather children to teach them the way of salvation, and not, as now, do the work of the nation by imparting the first elements of common school learning. This must prove a vast gain to the Church. But the sects are alarmed. Rome and our State Church are hand in hand to secure their grasp of public money for school purposes—that is, that the nation shall pay for converting its youth to the Roman faith on the one hand and, on the other, for preparing them by State Church education for the finishing touch of the priest. In some sixteen years, not less than £270,000 has been expended in government aid to Roman Catholic schools, because if our State Church schools are thus supported, those of the Roman Church must share the spoil. But the game is just upon over, and the education provided by the country will be wholly unsectarian. And what of all this? Paul desired his brethren to pray that the word of the Lord might have free course and be glorified. But inability to read has obstructed, and sectarian education has stood in its way—mighty barriers they have been! Pray on, brethren, and work, and the Word *shall* have unobstructed course. Never yet has it had a fair free path, and

never yet has the world been in a position to taste what the gospel tree will produce in a free soil, for the required and coming conditions have never yet been realized.

THE DENOMINATIONS are yearning for something better. Everywhere is the conviction that the Church is to be reconstructed. What must ensue may not yet be largely and clearly seen, but it is no small blessing to feel that changes will come because they must. The men of the Churches who do see somewhat as to the coming form, almost entirely look in the right direction and many Churches are gradually changing in approaching primitive order. The success of our work is larger by far in preparing the sects for ultimate union in *One Body*, than in gathering out persons who already realize to the full the true standing of the Church.

Onward, then, to battle move,
More than conqueror you shall prove :
Though opposed by many a foe,
Christian soldier, onward go !

MINISTRY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

SACERDOTALISM culminates in an Ecumenical Council and an Infallible Pope. When the apostle John saw a vision of the apostacy, he wondered with great astonishment. And well he might ! But extremes beget extremes. Scylla and Charybdis are an every day experience. Consequently Quakerism and its Modification, Plymouth-brethrenism, have been played off against Greek, Roman and Anglican Priestliness. *There the Priest is all—here the Holy Spirit is the President of the worshipping assembly and, theoretically, every believer takes that ministering place to which the Spirit moves him.* But Ministry in the Church of Christ, in view of these extremes, is distinctly central and has nothing in common with either. The Priest forbids his Lay-brother to preach or to minister the Ordinances. He sustains his prohibition by Scripture, misapplied, of course. He cites, "No man taketh this honor upon himself but he that is called of God as was Aaron." Aaron was called by a Prophet of God and set apart for his office by solemn consecration. But Paul's allusion to Aaron has no connexion with preaching, none with the ordinances of the Church, and none with any work or service committed to the children of God or to any class or section thereof. It refers solely, as the context proves, to the Priestly office of the Lord Jesus, and, therefore, when applied, as it commonly is, by Romanists, Anglicans, and Mormons, is either from dishonesty or ignorance, wrested from its true and undeniable meaning, in defiance of scope and context.

The Churches in which *The British Harbinger* freely circulates are not much troubled with priestly claims and pretence. If here or there an Evangelist, Pastor, or Deacon does, or is supposed to, take upon himself more than he ought, it is not on account of an assumed priestly prerogative, but owing to misunderstanding on his part, or on that of the Church, as to the duties of his particular charge. Misunderstandings of this kind now and then arise. We shall be disappointed if our present effort does not prove effectual in rendering them less frequent.

In the other direction the Churches referred to have, perhaps, more need of caution. The Plymouthian leaven, or some modification of it, is occasionally met with. "Ye may all prophesy one by one that all may learn and all may be comforted," is misapplied and made to mean that every member of the Church may teach and exhort in the assembly. Then,

too, it is assumed that office is to be taken as the result of faith in one's own fitness, and that, as this faith is a gift of the Spirit, no one has a right to stand between God and the man who desires office and has faith in his own fitness to fill it. Than this nothing has less Scripture sanction, and nothing can be more absurd. The Church, while yet the Scriptures of the New Covenant did not exist, received from the Holy Spirit "diversities of gifts." The natural endowments of men may be considered as gifts from God, for every good and perfect gift is from Him, but they are never attributed to the Holy Spirit, and certainly not included in the diversity of gifts referred to by the Apostle. The Spirit gifted to one *Prophecy*; to another, *Tongues*; to another, *Interpretation*; to another, *Healing*; to another, *Knowledge*; to another, *Faith* by which to work mighty deeds. But never do we read that to each member was gifted a faith which consisted in an exact measurement of its possessor's fitness for the diverse offices of the Church. Nor is there anything in man which, in this particular, can be relied upon. Whether Phrenology be based on truth or not, it is certain that some men have self-esteem far larger than their ability would warrant. Such men, in all good conscience, would put themselves in office for which they are not qualified. Others have self-esteem so small that they are never induced to undertake what, in every other respect, they are well fit for.

A book largely characterized by precious truths clearly expressed, has done something to popularize this Plymouthian error—"The Messiah's Ministry," by the late, most lamented, and highly-esteemed T. H. Milner, is alluded to. There is reason for believing that had he lived the book would have been, in this particular, considerably modified. But he was not spared to us, and, therefore, this and much more good service remains for other hands. In the volume in question we read—"It is thus for the brethren, recognizing their indebtedness to the favour of God for all the gifts they possess, to think of themselves with respect thereto precisely according to the divinely implanted faith therein. When God bestows gifts he gives faith in the possession of them whereby the holder may know and feel his responsibility; and it is, therefore, the duty of the possessor to make that faith the rule of the use of his gift or gifts. . . . Are human tribunals to be established to determine the liberties and abilities of men in the use of the gifts which God has given them? Or shall they not rather be taught, as the apostle teaches the disciples, their amenability to the Giver of the favours they are supposed to possess? The latter manifestly."

Now the sentiment of the foregoing extract is opposed to good order, destructive of edification, and without Scripture authority. The writer protests, as well he might, against a "monopoly of ministerialism." But there is a distinct middle path. The man's own judgment as the sole ground of his taking office and the monopoly referred to are both extremes, and alike bad. Either would sadly afflict the Church. The true and scriptural rule will be adduced in a subsequent article of this series.

The ground intended to be gone over embraces Ministry, or Service, in General—Priesthoods, Divine and human—The Minister—Apostles—Prophets—Evangelists—Bishops—Teachers—Deacons—and other Ministrants.

It is requested that our readers test every point and present for reconsideration every well sustained objection, and that without waiting, so that while the section referred to is before us the supposed defective item may, if needful, have further notice. Communications thus suggestive

either for publication or private consideration will be welcome, and not less so should they come from persons not with us.

D. K.

JESUS THE CHRIST IN HISTORY.

SOME of the most eulogistic works in praise of Jesus of Nazareth, that have been recently published, were written by men who entirely deny His supernatural character. They exhibit Him to us simply as the *ideal man*—such a being as was never seen on earth before, and has never been reproduced since. All that is told us of His exceptional birth, of His miracles, His resurrection and ascension, of His Divine Sonship, of His identity with the Godhead, and the peculiar efficacy of His atoning sacrifice, we must regard as a delusion; but, when we have stripped off the mythological drapery which has been thrown around this extraordinary Man, there is a moral grandeur in the heroic figure that is revealed to our view, which warrants us in saying that whatever may be the surprises of the future, *Jesus will never be surpassed*. His worship will grow young without ceasing; His legend will call forth tears without end; His sufferings will melt the noblest hearts; all ages will proclaim that, among the sons, of men, *there is none born greater than Jesus*.

A phenomenon like this demands explanation, and we begin our inquiries by asking, whether there was any thing in the *character of the age* when Jesus lived that serves to account for the existence of such a man, as He is represented to be? Had *humanity* become developed to such a point, that it was reasonable to look for such a being as Jesus? Had long ages of experience and culture been operating upon the rough material of human nature, until at last all its finer and nobler elements culminated in this man? In the fulness of *time*, and in the choicest *region* of the earth, did the choicest *family* of the most advanced *race* ripen into this perfect fruit?

There is nothing to sustain such a theory as this. The palmy days of Palestine had long been past. It had degenerated into a tributary province, ruled by a succession of demagogues, who worked their way into power by meanness and cruelty. No true prophet had spoken in Judea for four hundred years. Judaism had become a system of superstitious observances, and its worship was a wearisome routine. The foolish conceits of the Rabbis formed the substance of the popular theology. The more intelligent men of the times were indifferent to all forms of religion. There was not a man distinguished for intellectual power or moral excellence in all the nation, not one whose name would not have been forgotten when he died, if Jesus had never lived. Politically, intellectually, and morally, Palestine was in her dotage.

And yet, at this period, and among this debilitated people, there appears in the dark horizon a *LIGHT*, which gradually turns the night into day. For the first and the last time in the history of the world a *perfect man* appears!

How is this phenomenon to be explained? Was there anything in His *parentage*, His *education*, the peculiar *influences* which surrounded Him in His boyhood, to account for it? He is brought up under the roof of a respectable mechanic in Nazareth. Of Joseph, His reputed father, we know nothing, except that he appears to have been an upright, honest man—ready to regard the voice of God, when he heard it distinctly; but there is no reason to suppose that he exerted any special influence over the boy, whose name has since become so illustrious. Of Mary, His

mother, from whom he derived His humanity, we have fuller notice, and are led to form a much loftier conception. The wonderful words of her wondrous Child sank deep into her heart, and were remembered and cherished there, long after others had forgotten them. She had a spiritual insight, which no other woman of Judea shared with her—a tenderness and a purity which we can honour and love, without adoring her as divine—blessed above women, she was the fit mother of a spotless child. But it is the power of the child over the mother, and not that of the mother over the child, which always arrests our attention; the ordinary relation seems to be reversed, and the parent does homage to the offspring.

And, *outside* of the family circle, what were the influences to which Jesus was subjected from His childhood! He was brought up in a secluded village of a remote province—a place so low and obscure, that a proverbial disgrace was connected with its name, and people wondered how any good thing could come from such a region. His only companions were the uncultivated peasants of Nazareth; tradition says that he was engaged in the laborious calling of His reputed father; probably the only books that He ever saw were the sacred rolls of the law kept in the village synagogue, and, perhaps, some Rabbinical commentary circulated among the people. 'Jesus did not even know the name of Buddha, Zoroaster, or Plato; he had read no Greek book, no Buddhist sutra, and yet there is in Him more than one element which, without His knowledge, came from Buddhism, from Parseeism, or from the wisdom of the Greeks.' He would not have been likely to hear in Nazareth any *public* instruction, tending to enlighten Him in any very elevated spiritual truths? there was no *Socrates*, to teach the divinest Plato of God and immortality—no *Paul*, to expound to him the prophets—no *John*, to show Him the depths of Heaven's love.

Out of this dull background the full-formed figure of Jesus suddenly flashes into light. There is no *visible* preparation for His great work—no pupillage, no study, no discipline, no earthly antecedent to account for the phenomenon. The ideal man, He for whose advent the world had been waiting through weary centuries, suddenly appears—moves about Galilee and Judea for a few months, and then vanishes from the scene. But, during this short space, He has *said* something, He has *done* something, which has made the world another place to what it was before, and man another being to what he was before; even the face of *eternity* is changed, and the *grave* itself has become radiant. *His name* has become a talisman—the *slave* hears it, and leaps in his chains—the *sinner* hears it, and ceases from his sin—the *weary* and *heavy laden* hear it, and find rest—the *dying saint* hears it, and falls asleep in Jesus.

It will not be questioned that no human being has ever impressed the world like Jesus of Nazareth. The quiet words that he uttered, as He sat with a little group of disciples on some Galilean hill-side, have been taken on the wings of the wind and carried to every quarter of the earth. What he *said*, and *did*, and *endured*, soon found its chroniclers, and this record has become the sacred Book of the most civilized of modern nations, and has received the extraordinary title of 'The Word of God.'

His influence has reached *all* races and classes of men. In the *universality* of His influence Jesus stands alone. Other men have left their impress upon some particular nation, or upon a peculiar order of people in various nations; but the followers of this Jewish teacher forget that He was a Jew, and the place of his birth has become idealised as 'The Holy Land.' Unlike philosophy and science, the religion of Jesus

has gone before, instead of following in the wake of, civilisation ; and civilisation has *followed*, as a necessary consequence.

And this extraordinary influence has affected *all* the various relations of men—political, social, and personal. It has revolutionized governments, introduced new elements into society, changed the whole aspect of family ties, and given men strength to subdue the passions of their own nature. It found *despotism* enthroned everywhere ; just so far as its principles prevail, it gives to the people all the civil liberty which they are competent to exercise, while, at the same time, it protects them from the evils of anarchy. It found *society* disordered, inharmonious, groaning under abuses and excesses ; it is gradually restoring order, equality, and fraternity. It found the *family relation* disarranged—woman, the ignorant servitor of man, and the purity of home defiled by polygamy ? it is now weaving around the household a white robe of sanctity, securing to the wife and mother her legitimate rights, and it has assigned to her the highest sphere of influence which mortal can attain.

This reorganising, purifying, elevating power is *steadily increasing* ; it has, in itself, a vitality which is irresistible. The influence of Jesus can no more be exterminated than the law of gravity can be destroyed. There is no more reason to fear that Christianity will ever die out than there is to believe that the earth will cease to revolve. After having survived the antagonisms which it has already overcome, there is no further cause for apprehension. Persecution cannot *kill* it, and patronage cannot *smother* it. It lived through the long night of a thousand years, when its beams were shorn, and its life seemed well-nigh gone ; and then the sun rose brighter than ever. And it will live on, till the heavens and the earth shall be rolled up as a parched scroll and pass away.

The influence which Jesus has exerted is *peculiar in its nature*.

It is not that of *physical force*. The cause of Christ has advanced most successfully when it has received the least assistance from the secular arm. When men have gone before with a sword to open the way, Christianity has *refused* to follow. When the attempt has been made to enforce the forms of this faith by violence, the *spirit* has deserted the form and left it empty. The dreariest days of Christianity were those when the trumpet of the warrior was sounded in her behalf. The imperial patronage of Constantine did the Church greater harm than all the attacks of Julian. If she had only been *let alone*, to work out her true results by her own vital force, Christianity would have been a hundred-fold stronger than she is to-day.

Neither is the influence of Christ's truth that of a *system of philosophy*. It harmonises with *all* forms of sound philosophy ; but it has truths which are peculiar to itself, and it handles these after a fashion peculiar to itself. Jesus perplexed His hearers with no metaphysical subtleties. He dealt very little in abstractions. He elaborated no ambitious theories. The most unlearned could comprehend what He said as readily as the Scribes.

Neither is the influence of Christianity that of *superstition*. Just so far as this element has been incorporated into the original Gospel, its true power has been vitiated. In the teachings of Christ there is a singular freedom from every thing likely to minister to that feeling of superstitious reverence and fear which is so natural to man. He envelopes His doctrine in no gorgeous clouds of *mystery*—never calls upon us to suspend the operations of our *reason* in order to believe—makes no vague, exaggerated appeals to our *passions*. His utterance is calm, His argument convincing,

and His exhortation persuasive. Who can conceive of a congregation shouting and howling with mad excitement, under such a discourse as the Sermon on the Mount? Superstition appears in very opposite forms of manifestation; the Christ of the Gospels is equally free from it in *every* form. As a man, He was natural and simple; He ate and drank like other men; wore no embroidered phylacteries; there is not a trace in His life of wild enthusiasm, or melancholy asceticism, or hollow formalism, or puerile symbolism. He prescribed no religious routine, no recipes for penance and self-torture, and gave His Church no rules for getting up an excitement.

Neither is the influence of this system that of *dry and barren dogma*. We hear nothing from Christ of federal headship—of the imputation of sin or of goodness—of sin before volition, as distinguished from the sin which consists in sinning—of natural inability or moral ability—of Divine decrees as the basis of distinguishing grace—nothing of irresistible grace, or prevenient grace, or the grace of congruity; but He tells men how they must *feel*, and what they must *do*, in order to enter the kingdom of heaven. All the *systematic* theology that He taught could be put into a very small compass; but all the *truth* which He taught, in all its bearings, would require an eternity to fathom.

We stand, then, in the presence of the most significant fact in history. The existence of Jesus Christ was the pivot upon which the destiny of the world turned.

Here is a man, born and bred in obscurity—with no advantages of education—without rank, wealth, or associates—a man who never had a *home* that He could call His own—who never had a *follower* of any note while He lived on earth—hated by the leading men of His time, in both Church and State—a man who died by the hands of the law, and was buried by charity; and yet to-day, instead of dating our letters and papers and all other documents *Anno Mundi*, it is 'In the year of our Lord.' as though man first began *to live* when Jesus walked in Jewry; kings and emperors are anointed in *His* name; the most gorgeous temples on the face of the earth are consecrated to *His* worship; millions upon millions believe that there is eternal salvation *only* through *Him*; the history of the last eighteen centuries has taken its form from *Him*; and there is no name in heaven or earth that is spoken with the same reverence as the name of JESUS.

It does not matter *how* you account for the existence of such a being as this; whether you believe Him to 'have been conceived by the Holy Ghost,' or not; whether you believe that 'in Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,' or not; whether you believe that He healed the sick, opened the eyes of the blind, and cast out devils, or not; whether you believe he was raised from the dead or not; *he is still a miracle!* He does not fall within the range of ordinary historical phenomena. He is an exceptional Being. He cannot be explained by science and philosophy.

The *great* evidence of Christianity is Christ. And He authenticates Himself. The most *natural* solution of His life is the *supernatural*. The truths which he uttered were not truths which He had learned; *He was the truth*. The works, the wonders and signs, that he performed, were the natural development of His superhuman power.

As material nature is the embodiment of God's *physical* attributes, so is Jesus the Incarnation of His *moral and spiritual* attributes. God becomes accessible—in a measure, comprehensible—through Him. He mediates between the infinite and finite; bringing them into conjunction in His

own person. I do not care to distinguish the natures, and say of Christ that He did *this* as man, and *that* as God; this only confuses the matter of His identity; the natures are merged in one Being, I bow before the mystery, and do not ask to have it resolved.—*Biblical Notes and Queries.*

WORDS FROM THE WORK TABLE. No. XXVIII.

LEAVES AND FRUIT.

"Now in the morning as he (Jesus) returned unto the city, he hungered, and when he saw a fig tree in the way, he came to it, and found nothing thereon, but leaves only, and said unto it, let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever. And presently the fig tree withered away." Matt. xxi. 18 and 19.

"Fig trees are very common in Palestine, and flourish in a dry and sandy soil, although in our climate they are little more than shrubs, yet in the East they attain to a considerable height, and some of them are capable of affording shelter to a large number of horsemen. The shade of the fig tree is very pleasant; and to sit under it is an emblem of security and peace. 'But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid; for the mouth of the Lord of hosts has spoken it' Micah iv. 4. Fig trees begin to sprout at the time of the vernal equinox. The fruit makes its appearance before the leaves and flowers, and the foliage expands about the end of March. The fig trees of Palestine are of three kinds:—1. The *Untimely Fig*, which puts forth at the vernal equinox, and before it is ripe is called the *green fig*, but when it is ripe, the *untimely fig*. It comes to maturity towards the end of June, and in flavour surpasses the other kinds. 2. The *Summer or Dry Fig*, appears about the middle of June, and is ripe in August. 3. The *Winter Fig*, which germinates in August, and does not ripen until about the end of November, it is longer and of a browner colour than the others. All figs when ripe, but especially the *Untimely*, fall spontaneously. It is well known that the fruit of these prolific trees always precedes the leaves; consequently, when Jesus saw one of them in full vigour, *having leaves*, he might, according to the common course of nature, very justly look for fruit and haply find some boccores, or early figs, if not some winter figs likewise upon it."

From this account of the fig tree we learn that it was not, as some affirm, a preposterous thing to expect to find fruit upon a tree that attracted attention by its adornment of leaves. It promised something more than common. It looked beautiful in the distance. But notwithstanding all its show, it was a *barren tree*! All its strength went to foliage. It was a hypocritical tree. Its very pretensions manifested its unsoundness. Its produce was only leaves, not fruit.

Christ taught much by object lessons, and thus impressed most forcibly upon the memory of his disciples his great truths. For this purpose he used the material nearest to hand, losing no fitting opportunity to impart instruction to the people.

We need not look into *all* that underlies the account of this miracle, nor of *all* that it foreshadowed to Israel, whose hypocritical words and works were but as leaves, not fruit which the Israel of God should bring forth. But we may draw therefrom a lesson for the followers of the meek and lowly one, who still hungers for the salvation of the world, and the purity of the Church.

The tree upon which Jesus looked was apparently a goodly tree; abundance of foliage gave hope of early ripened fruit, or of the last

years' growth, lusciously ripe, and carefully sheltered by the large green leaves. Jesus approached and put forth his hand to pluck, but found no fruit. Deceptive tree! The Lord of life and love must hunger on. No food to sustain his fainting frame and sinking spirit—plenty of show—abundance of leaves—but no fruit. Is it not often thus with professors of religion? They appear all right till tested by opposition, affliction, or temptation. Then they fall away from Christ, and his people, and shew ONLY LEAVES.

The Church may be viewed as the Lord's vineyard, and each disciple as a branch which can be known by the fruit it bears. We cannot find grapes on thorns or figs on thistles. Every tree must bring forth *good* fruit or in due time it must be hewn down to make room for better. Christ, as the husbandman, is careful and skilful. He prunes, and digs, and manures with the greatest patience. Weeds and trailers that undermine and destroy must be rooted out and the unfruitful cast out to be burned.

Sisters, what fruit are you producing for Christ? Some are prayerfully watchful over their own words and actions: ever alive to the interests of the Church; careful for the well-being and well-doing of the whole body; ready for every good word and work; untiring in the Master's service; looking not for earthly approbation, but content with the prospect of hearing "Well done, good and faithful servant" fall from the lips of Jesus. These in the hour of trial, of bereavement, or of affliction, realize a Father's love; and can rely upon the assurance "that all things shall work together for good to those who love the Lord." Though their hearts may be stricken and bleeding, yet can they humbly bow before the mercy-seat and breathe forth, "Not my will but thine, O Lord, be done." They are certainly *fruit-bearing* branches. Some of another class appear occasionally at meetings on Lord's-day morning, if the weather be fine or they wake early enough or can manage to arrange the dinner to their satisfaction or their clothing is in fashionable order. Others attend pretty regularly, but leave without much increase of knowledge or improvement of spirit—not having *feasted* upon Christ they retire without fitting nourishment whereby to bring forth the fruit of righteousness. There are also murmurers, who seem not able to pierce the dark clouds, nor to perceive their silver linings; but who look only upon the present moment, and who, in the hour of sickness or bereavement or affliction, see no over-ruling, guiding hand, but constantly iterate and re-iterate—"Why am I left alone? Why need I so to suffer? They comprehend not the language of the hymn:—

"Thy chastisements are Love—more deep
They stamp the seal divine;
And by a sweet compulsion, keep
Our spirits nearer Thine."

Must we not say that these produce ONLY LEAVES?

Brothers, what fruit bring ye forth for Christ? Some make a goodly show of foliage, with great dearth of fruit. Some are only *talkers*, whose talking is of little service to the body, but who, if not allowed to talk when and where and as long as they please, can or will do nothing else to extend the Redeemer's kingdom. Others are mere parasites, not producing fruit themselves, they become jealous of those who go forward doing the Lord's work with a single eye to His glory. Some strive to throw their roots and branches into the world's highway, thinking to combine the world and the church, and to enjoy both, forgetting the Lord's assertion—"Ye cannot serve two masters." These must also be classed among the unfruitful. What will the husbandman do when he looks over a vineyard with such therein? Will he not say—"Lo, these many years

I have sought fruit and found none; cut them down, why cumber they the ground?

Now is the time to escape from such a sentence. *Now* it is day wherein all can work and produce fruit for Jesus. Fruit manifested in the daily life, in the shop, in the factory, in the parlour, and in the kitchen. In every department Christ's disciples can show forth the fruits of the spirit. "Love, joy, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance."

Christ said—"The poor ye have always with you." As then, so now. There are the sick and afflicted to visit, the depressed to comfort and cheer, the erring, by kind and gentle means, to restore, the wayward to restrain, the ignorant to teach, and the young to train.

As the poor widow who had only a half farthing to give, but who gave it with a heart large enough to have given the world, was graciously approved by her Lord, so shall the disciple be who, having but one talent, lovingly devotes it to the service of Christ; not for worldly show, glory, or fame, but for love of Him who so loved the world, as to give Himself for it. His cause is one in which all can do something to spread the knowledge of His name. The poor, the rich, the learned, the illiterate, the weak, the strong—all can find scope for bringing forth fruit, such fruit as Christ will acknowledge when he comes. Contentious, pretentious, pharisaical followers will be rejected, as bearing LEAVES ONLY. The humble, earnest, self-denying Christ-imitating disciple will be approved, as *fruit* bearing, even as bearing *much* fruit.

Years are passing swiftly and much remains to be done ere the Lord comes to judge the people and to receive his ready bride. Would we hasten the time of His coming? Then must we be doers; not dreamers—not content to put forth leaves, beautiful though they be in their right season. We must be fruit bearers; fruit producers; even to a hundred-fold.

Sad indeed, will it be, if at the close of life, when vigour has departed, when "the almond tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden," if we have to take up the plaint of uselessness and disappointment.

"'Nothing but leaves!' the Spirit grieves
Over a wasted life,
O'er sin committed, while conscience slept,
Promises made but never kept,
Folly and shame and strife:
'Nothing but leaves!'

'Nothing but leaves!' and memory weaves
No veil to hide the past,
And as we trace our weary way,
Counting each lost and misspent day,
Sadly we find at last
'Nothing but leaves.'

And shall we meet the Master so,
Bearing our withered leaves?
The Saviour looks for perfect fruit;
Stand we before him sad and mute,
Waiting the words he breathes?—
'Nothing but leaves!'

"Beloved, do not imitate that which is evil, but that which is good. He that does good is of God." iii. John.

Birmingham.

LOUISE.

SPEAKING THE TRUTH IN LOVE.

SOME time since, being on a visit to a distant town, I had the privilege of meeting with the disciples there and was considerably impressed on entering the meeting-house by seeing, in large letters, at the back of the platform the words "Speaking the truth in love." What an appropriate motto, I thought, for such a place! The truth to be spoken from that platform is the gospel of God's love—the Good News of Salvation, proclaimed by those who are partakers thereof—and surely those who have tasted that the Lord is gracious, should, *in all love*, set forth this glorious truth to their fellow men, so that it may *win* souls to Christ. If men can be brought to feel that God is love, they must indeed be self-willed if they do not heartily yield themselves to His guidance who has done, and is ever doing, so much for them. But many have been taught to look upon God as an all-powerful avenging being. The love and goodness set forth in the gospel is hid behind the cloud of fear and dread which intervenes. Oh let it be our aim to dispel this cloud, that the light of the glorious gospel may shine into the hearts of those around us.

Unhappily some who have known the blessing of walking in God's ways, whose ways are indeed ways of pleasantness, and whose paths are peace—have, by yielding to temptation, lost that peace and joy which belong to the obedient believer. In such cases, how necessary to speak the truth *in love*; for when one has strayed from the right path, he is generally ill at ease with himself; and unless he experiences that repentance which needs not to be repented of, he is likely to shrink from what may be said to restore. Those then who have the winning back duty to perform, should be exceedingly careful to do it in love, that they may not fail to bring back the erring one to the right path. "He that winneth souls is wise."

HELEN.

GOD'S GIFTS.

God gives us treasures, not that we may spend
Life and affection on them, as the end
For which he gave;
But—grateful for the gift—that we may bring
To His beloved shrine our offering—
Devote it there.
And there, in that glad hour, review the past,
When duty was undone, and life lay waste:
And then and there, in truth, our pledge renew,
To worship Him aright, and live anew.
So shall not His good gifts our pleasures cloy;
But stimulate our life, and aid our joy;
And coming, as they do, to test our love,
They shall confirm our faith—our fealty prove
To Him who gave.

J. C.

Open Council.

THE FALLEN TABERNACLE OF DAVID RESTORED.

THE notice of my former paper by G. Greenwell would have rendered good service had he gone thoroughly into the facts and arguments and shewn wherein my exposition is incorrect. This he has not done, but he presents a worn out Judaizing theory, which in time past blinded me far more injuriously than ever the fogs of Lincolnshire could have done. Our friend's sweeping assertions have left every point of my paper standing as a refutation of his exposition of Acts xv. And what can he see in my comment on that chapter akin to the doctrine of the Gnostics, or as ridiculous as "a figurative ride on a spiritual donkey"? On what principle can G. G. object to apply the names and phrases common to the house of Jacob to Christ and his Church? Were they not a *typical* people? Were not their passover, passage through the sea, priesthood, tabernacle, &c., types of the things of the kingdom of God's dear Son? In many instances the names of types are transferred to their antitypes, for example—"Christ our passover," "Our great High Priest," "priests," "priesthood," "spiritual sacrifices," "chosen generation," "seed of Abraham," "Israel," "Jew," "circumcision," &c. Are these simple agreements, and not fulfilments? Is this divine method of address Gnostic doctrine, explaining verities "by emanation and phantasma"? Now, if Christians are "the seed of Abraham, Israelites, and Jews," are they not on the *same* principle the house of Jacob also? Will Christ have *two* houses, one his church and the other the house of Jacob? It is absolutely certain that the church is his house, kingdom, or nation. But if Christ's own house (the church) is not the house of Jacob over which he will for ever reign, then it follows that our Lord will have *two* houses—the church and the house of Jacob. Here let me inquire when this supposed house of Jacob becomes the glory of the latter day, how it shall be formed? Shall it be founded on different principles from the Building of God, the Church? If not—if the people of the house of Jacob have to believe, repent, and be baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, then will they be simply the Church of Christ over again; and if our friend has any residue of consistency left, it surely will compel him to call the Church *now* the house of Jacob, as it will in his own judgment be so then. But on the other hand, if this dispensation and the spiritual house of Christ must give place to the house of Jacob, what kind of dispensation or house will that be? Will there be the Mosaic law over again, which once vanished away? If so, then it comes to this, that shortly we shall have another dispensation, another gospel, another house, people, nation, or kingdom; another system of worship, consisting of the Covenant of Sinai re-established, with or without modifications, destined to *outshine* the glory of the ministration of the Spirit, which is unerringly said to be "more glorious"! If this be true, how strange! how passing strange, that the Great Teacher, nor his Apostles, never thus expounded the Law, the Psalms, and the Prophets.

But G. G.'s notions are at variance both with Old Testament facts and New Testament exegesis. He affirms that the kingdom of Israel will be a sinful kingdom in some age yet to come! whereas the prophet Amos speaks but of a sinful kingdom; not of a sinful king to come, but of that which existed in that day. Then he says, that out of this sinful kingdom there shall arise "an awful person at the head of it," claiming "*exclusive*

Godhead." Such future kingdom and person are vain imaginings. Such an awful person, claiming *exclusive* Godhead, is nowhere a subject of prophecy. He may refer to 2 Thess. There is nothing in that epistle about "*exclusive* Godhead." "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is *called* God" looks to the many lords or gods of the world. There were "*gods many, and lords many.*" These expressions do not necessarily include the supreme God, who indeed is God from everlasting to everlasting. Again, "*as God*" does not imply "*exclusive* Godhead," but denotes merely *another* God, or one among others. But "*as God*" is omitted in three of the oldest manuscripts. It is a fact that the Papal ministry has claimed the powers of Deity, above *gods many*, and lordship above *lords many*—above all that are called gods or lords. And in doing this under the Christian name, such a man as this opposes the Father and his Son—usurps and denies the true government of the Godhead.

Again, our friend affirms that the ten tribes have not been restored to their land. Did not the Lord through Cyrus, his "*shepherd*," proclaim their full freedom to return? They had *equal liberty* with the tribes of Judah and Benjamin to do so, and they did return at the same time in common with them? Did not the Lord *return* to Mount Zion at the expiration of the captivity, and reign there *as before*? And were not the sacrifices offered at the re-built temple for the *twelve tribes*, as in days of old, before their captivity? Was not that house erected for all Israel—all the tribes having equal right to worship there? And did not the captivity of the *twelve tribes* open up a highway from all the nations of the earth that they might go up to the house of God in Jerusalem, and learn of his ways? Did not godly Jews who remained among the nations go up to keep the feasts—the feast of tabernacles, &c., year after year, *throughout all the centuries till Christ came*? And did not this very state of things make thousands of pious Gentiles and facilitate the way for the proclamation of the gospel among the nations? Then when this most wonderful providence had prepared the way for the Gospel era—the new world, (to ancient worshippers before Christ it was the *world to come*.) did not Christ appear in the *end of the world*, (Mosaic world,) to put an end to the Old Covenant worship at Jerusalem, and to all pilgrimages from the nations thither for worship? Hence the Christ says—"*Believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain nor yet in Jerusalem, worship the Father,*" intimating the removal of the old way of worship. Afterwards he refers to the new and living way. "*The hour cometh* and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." And now, friend G., is this new way of worship (so acceptable to the Father, but which the unbelieving Jew calls heresy) to pass away for that idol of your fancy, which you style "*The structures of eternity*"? Fine words, indeed, but of no meaning in this case.

True, quite true, are the words—"They (the Jews) shall no more be pulled up out of their land." They never were, as a nation of the Lord, pulled out of the land after their return from captivity till the end of the world—namely, the Jewish world. Christ appeared in the end of that world to put an end to it. Under any circumstance, even if the Jews shall return to their land after Mr. Greenwell's fashion, they will not remain in it *for ever*, for the heavens and the earth are to pass away in fire with a great noise. So the words "*no more*," &c., do not necessarily mean endless, unless the context, or the revealed purposes of God demand it. When the wrath of God came to the uttermost upon the unbelieving Jews by Vespasian and Titus, they were at that time not his people, and

that in a sense which they as a nation *never had before experienced*. Now they were not under Moses, for the law, *had passed away*, and was no more in force as a divine institution. *It was not so with them under former chastisements, banishments, &c.* Now they had rejected the Christ, and in so doing *rejected Moses and the Father*. Then what are they? They are not under the old covenant, for it has vanished away. They are not under Christ, the only name given under heaven whereby they can be saved. To the Jews the Saviour said, "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall *die in your sins*." What then are they better than the rest of unsaved people who know not God and obey not the gospel of the Lord Jesus?

James applies the words of Amos to the preaching of Christ as LORD OF ALL—Lord of Jew and Gentile. He does not apply them to an age after the calling in of the Gentiles. Any man who will persist in merely affirming this, is not to be reasoned with. Will our friend explain in what particulars the rebuilding of David's tabernacle, and the turning of the Gentiles to Christ resemble each other, for he intimates that there is an *agreement*, but not a fulfilment? Here again he sadly errs, in supposing that I think there is a semblance between the building of David's tabernacle and the conversion of the Gentiles. I do not think so. The Gentiles seeking, or turning to the Lord Jesus, is an effect or *result* of the tabernacle of David being restored, and *not* the rebuilding of the tabernacle itself. The restored tabernacle consists of the exaltation of Jesus (who was of the fallen house of David)* as a Prince and Saviour—to His being made Christ and Lord over all; which exaltation, or *restored* lordship to the tabernacle (house or family of David) was preached by Peter, *to effect an ingathering of Jew and Gentile* under Him who had thus obtained the *key of David*, and who, therefore, "openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth," for "HE IS LORD OF ALL"!! This being the case, our friend's remarks also on the word RETURN—"return to Gentiles"—go for nothing, for the Lord's return was not to them but to the fallen tabernacle of David to re-build it, that Gentiles as well as Jews might seek after the Lord.

Derby.

E. EVANS.

THE TABERNACLE OF DAVID.—No. II.

My former article contained little more than a declaration of my own views on this subject. It was simply a contrastive statement without direct collision. It has since been suggested to me that I should pay a little attention to the article of Br. Evans. This I am about to do as a matter of courtesy. I saw Br. Evans standing in the mist, and Du Veil, D.D., a degenerate Hebrew, standing at his right hand. Du Veil muttered something of this kind, "Again the use which some make of 'after this,' as having reference to a time yet future, gives the strange idea that 'the residue of men' might not now 'seek after the Lord' But does not the Gospel invite them to seek after Him? The Lord's commission is—'Go ye therefore and teach all nations.' 'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.' 'The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent.' 'God our Saviour who will have all men to be saved.' Does not such language

* "R. Nachman said to R. Isaac, Hast thou heard when the 'Son of the fallen' shall come? He answered, Who is he? R. Nachman; The Messiah. R. Isaac; Is the Messiah so called? R. Nachman; Yea; 'In that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David which is fallen down.'—*Talmud*."

reach the residue of men, that they might seek after the Lord? If not, then such men are not within the limits of this world!"

So far under the *veil*, something better may come when we get it lifted. It would puzzle even a D.D., veiled or unveiled, to explain how "*All Nations*," could form a *residue* or *remnant*—but I pass that over.

It is more than probable that Du Viel, D.D., never thought deeply on the *limits* of that "world" into which the commission was sent. A decree once went out from Cæsar Augustus that "*all the world*" should be taxed—which decree was duly executed. A mandate went out from a greater King that "*all the world*" should hear the Gospel. We have evidence that this decree was likewise executed, for the Gospel was carried into all the world; and Paul avouches himself as a witness that it was "*preached to every creature under heaven*." The "*limits of the world*" were the same in both these cases. All the Roman world was *taxed*, and all the Roman world heard the Gospel. It delivers us from the snares of Mormonism and kindred systems, when we get a firm and decided grasp of this matter. A certain number of noble ambassadors who had been witnesses of foundation facts, went forth on a Mission, clothed with spiritual power and supernatural credentials, and their Mission was perfectly accomplished, amid the affluent exhibition of all the signs and wonders which had been promised.

But, though all the nations of the Roman world heard the gospel as a witness, and the end of the miraculous age arrived—yet what limitation we find on looking closer. Central Africa was unknown; America undiscovered; Hindostan not included; not to mention a thousand Isles in southern or northern regions, where the spices blow profusely from lustrous fields, over languishing savages; or where the consumers of raw fish on desolate shores, are frozen in the darkness.

It is quite clear that many millions of human creatures never heard a word of that gospel which went out into "*all the world*," and was preached to "*every creature which is under heaven*." It is one of the mysteries which must remain in the abysses of the divine mind. The millions who lived and died in such darkness are in some way comprehended in the plan of infinite love, and we leave them in the hands of Him whose mercies are larger than our speculations.

We can see a little way into the reason of the limitation. Within a given area civilisation had been transmitted from nation to nation, in four successive empires. In conflicts of reason or force, in council and battle-field, in labour to harmonize liberty with law—in commerce—in fine arts, in science and philosophy, in lawgivers, and priesthoods, and theatres, and temples, the process of training had proceeded. In a defined domain God had been educating humanity for the reception of the highest science, and in the fullness of the time he sent forth his son.

The clause beginning with "After this" is not to be found in Amos. In so far as this is a difficulty, it presses equally on *both* sides, or upon all parties of believers. Though it matters but little in the settlement of the great question under consideration, yet we are equally concerned in the true explication on critical and moral grounds generally. The commentators have dealt with it according to their several faculties. The obtuse have been unconscious of it; the gymnasts have vaulted over it; the logical have turned it in the grinding mill, from whence it has come out hard and insoluble as ever. I have never been oppressed or troubled by it. The apostle James, standing on the same supernatural platform as the prophet Amos, supplies the words by authority, as a link of sequence, to connect the work narrated by Simeon, with the prediction of the prophet, in the true order of development. No man could have done such a thing safely, unless he had drunk from the same fountain of inspiration as the old seer.

This seems the right place to leave Du Veil, and turn to the man who called up that empty shade from his companion shadows. I thought once that nothing could equal the absurdity of our Lord being actually on the throne of David, ruling over the house of Jacob—while the house of Jacob is in dispersion and unbelief, the country desolate, and the throne in ruins. Br. Evans has, however, furnished a suitable companion piece. He has discovered that the Lord has spoken peace to the heathen, and broken the sword, and bow, and battle, from the earth. I have heard of simplicity, but this is as verdant as the vale of Cashmere. From the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, to the pillage and sack of Rome by Attila and Alaric. From the carnage among Germanic nations, to the wars of the French Revolution, and from thence to the awful battle in America, the earth has been one great slaughter-house, and the complaining rivers have run reddened with blood. God will put an end to the sword and the battle when the King inaugurates the times of retribution—and removes from Israel the blindness and ungodliness—but at present it requires rare eyes to see in accomplishment either the throne of David, or the abolition of the battle-field.

According to my analysis of Br. E's. article, the core of it is found in two assumptions, now to be examined—1. That if Jesus Christ reigns over the Jews outwardly, His kingdom will be of this world.—2. That the throne of David has been re-built in the resurrection of Christ. I take them in this order.

"If it be true that Jesus is to reign over the Jew outwardly, the literal *fleshly* house of Jacob, then his kingdom will be of this world." This is a fair sample of the kind of stuff which men impose on themselves for reasoning, and as our friend represents a large class of illumanati, it will be of some service to smite it hip and thigh. An exposition if not exhaustive yet somewhat close is demanded. In the most ordinary sense to be in *the flesh* is to be in a state of alienation from God, under the dominion of fleshly instincts and passions. This state—according to God's ideal, though alas! not always in absolute fact—finishes when our old man is crucified and buried, and a divine guest is sent into the house from which the evil spirits have been cast out. "But ye are *not in the flesh* but in the spirit, if so be that the spirit of God dwell in you." It is expected that the *old man* of nature will be drowned in the laver of regeneration, and that a new man will arise. "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature. Old things are passed away; behold all things are become new."

But, in another sense, even the regenerated are still in *the flesh*, and cannot inherit the kingdom of God without a second regeneration, more sensible in glory, more open in splendour and power, though not more important than the former. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." Hence, inheritance in the glorious kingdom is only accomplished by resurrection from the dead incorruptible, and by transformation of the living corresponding to such change of the dead, one great work in essential unity. But even then there will still be men in the flesh upon earth in both senses, though not *inheriting* the kingdom. The Lord is to have the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost part of the earth for his possession; but such heathen in the beginning of his glorious reign are neither glorified nor converted. They have simply been placed under more auspicious circumstances, have come into the grand school of God for discipline and training in truth and righteousness.

In view of such premises, inheritance in the kingdom of God depends,—

1st. Upon the regeneration of the spirit, that revolution of the inward man which is evidenced by holiness unto the Lord.

2nd. Upon the transformation of the body into immortal beauty among the children of the resurrection.

3rd. But there may be subjects of the kingdom who remain *in the flesh* in both senses, neither regenerated within nor glorified without, not delivered either from sin or from mortality.

4th. It is likewise important to notice that in so far as the *flesh* represents the essential structure and nature of man, separate from vileness and corruptibility, the glorified people of God and the Master himself will be *in the flesh* all through eternity. The resurrection body of our Lord, minus the blood which was all spilled in sacrifice, was still a body of flesh and bones, to be seen and handled and identified. Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom, but flesh and bones, another combination, can; for such was the structural humanity which our Lord carried to the right hand of God as the first-born of the family. Some have dreamed of another change on the road into the central holy place, but there is no reason and there are no documents. It is clear that he veiled the glory of his resurrection body in the mysterious visits of the forty days, or they would have had one brighter than the sun in their midst, and such presence would have been overpowering. A few glimpses of the glory of the resurrection body have been given in momentary radiance. There was one prophetic and symbolic, on the mountain, of transfiguration; another when Saul was stricken down to the earth, and his crusade of darkness and cruelty terminated; and again, in the lone isle where John fell as if slain till he was revived by the hand of living power and the voice of infinite love. There was one of the olden time who spake out the hope which was the lamp in his darkness: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand in the latter day upon the earth. And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my *flesh* shall I see God." It would do much in restoring manliness and Godliness, much in giving distinctness and reality to the future, if men would forsake the shadowy and unreal. We are not to be visionary ghosts floating in cloudland, or shadows on the tapestry of darkness. Let us leave the vapoury creatures of luminous ether for poets to play with when fancy has the reins, and look onward to the substantial earth and the solid city where the reconstruction of humanity will be no dream, but where men essentially the same, yet wonderfully changed, will, in full personality of materialism and spirit, exercise power and enjoy life in justice and in purity. The growth of Biblical realism will not only give us aright solemn and realizing views of our own prime glory in the supreme power, but will give the secondary matters of the Hebrew theocracy similar clearness and abiding consistency. People with anointed eyes and strong hold on definite principles of interpretation will no more dream of seeking the "throne of David" in the heavens, or the "house of Jacob" among the Gentiles, than they would think of seeking Mount Lebanon among the Derbyshire hills, or the River Jordan in the Vale of Clyde.

Having laid these foundations, I return to the statement under consideration, about the *outward* few and the kingdom of *this world*.

1st. From the beginning God has been King and Ruler over the nations. The throne of the Lord is in heaven, from whence his decrees issue in putting down one and exalting another. Notwithstanding the impiety and rebellion of the nations, God has never abdicated his throne or

renounced his sovereignty. He has always been ruling over men in the flesh, but his kingdom is not of this world.

2. Besides his general rule God had a more special kingdom in Israel. "And what one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to himself, and to make him a name, and to do for you great things and terrible, for thy land, before thy people, which thou redeemedst to thee from Egypt, from the nations and their Gods. For thou hast confirmed to thyself thy people Israel, to be a people unto thee for ever; and thou, Lord, art become their God." In this peculiar and more sanctified domain God was special king and law-giver, ruling over outward Jews—men in the flesh—but his kingdom was not of this world.

3. From the beginning of the Christian Church our Lord Christ has been at the head of it—and our friend is among those who call it a kingdom, and represent Christ as reigning over the church and among the nations. If this be so, most assuredly he is ruling over men in the flesh; but his kingdom is not of this world. I wish to speak modestly in this matter. Br. E. and his friends may have reached the glorified state—but we in this district are still in the flesh.

Hence then, the argument that government over men in the flesh must be of this world, gives a base and earthy origin to the kingdom of God,—general or special—likewise to the authority of Christ in the visible Church, or among the nations.

I have confuted our friend on ground of his own choosing. This was necessary for his sake. With regard to the public—the general readers—I might have taken a shorter road. I have never read or heard from any quarter that our Lord was coming to reign over merely outward Jews. All the promises of latter-day glory to the Hebrew race—in inviolate land, established monarchy, and unfailing privileges, are in connection with the lifting of the veil—the contrition of the heart, the copious outpouring of new life from the spirit of God. Only by Christ, and in Christ, can they recover their territory and their ancient glory. At least the perpetual possession depends upon a new heart and a new spirit, upon passage through the gates of regeneration and resurrection from the dead. Blindness, unbelief, enmity, ungodliness, must all flee away as birds of the darkness, and the true light shine in the reception of the King and the Reconciler. If Br. E. ever imagined anything different to this, he must have been in strange company.

I now pass to the second assumption of Br. E.'s in which his confusion is chiefly embodied. In fact, the darkness is like that which once settled over Egypt, and we have no miraculous force. But it may be possible to hang up a lamp or two in that strange and dreary region.

To argue that because God raised up Christ to sit upon David's throne—that he is by consequence sitting upon that throne now—is a curious simulacrum of reason. God raised up Christ from the dead that he might ask and receive the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession; but as yet the world lieth in the arms of the wicked one. The true monarch has not yet put forth his great power in driving out the usurper and taking possession. God raised up Christ from the dead that he might be the judge of all men—in fact it is by the resurrection that the assurance is given to all men—But the day of judgment has not arrived yet. In like manner Christ has been raised from the dead to sit upon the throne of David, and rule over the house of Jacob, for the government will be upon his shoulder, but for all these

things we wait for his "appearing and his kingdom." The reader who desires to study the subject, may read the judgment of the nations in the valley of Jehoshaphat, which transpires before the throne of David is revealed, or the tabernacle raised out of ruins. But let us look at the matter closer. The throne of David was the throne of God in a deep real sense, for it was a divinely constituted royalty in a God given Lord over a chosen people where the laws were of heavenly origin. Hence we read in 1 Chron. xxix., "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as King, instead of David his Father; and prospered, and all Israel obeyed him." This can never happen again until the house of Jacob, the people of Israel, are restored to the land of promise; nor until a literal descendant of David sits upon the throne of power, with judicial administration. Hence the one who was "born King of the Jews," must return and occupy the throne of his Father David.

But now for another phase—though the throne of David was—and must again be the throne of the Lord—yet the convex of this never was, and never can be true. The throne of the eternal God in the heavens never was the throne of David. David has not ascended into heaven—and if he were there he could have no seat in that central throne where the insufferable light veils the Almighty in majesty of darkness. Our friends do not wish to blaspheme, but their conception borders on blasphemy, and a man of reverence would tremble even in thinking of such a thing. The only one who can sit on that awful throne is the one who was in the "form of God" before he took on him the "form of man," whose goings forth have been from of old, even from eternity. We have a promise of sitting in the throne of the Son, but never in the throne of the Father, and the distinction is beautiful. It is because the Son has a divine side that he can sit in the throne of the Father. It is because he has a human side that *we* can sit in the throne of the Son. He that overcometh shall sit down with me in *my* throne, even as I overcame, and am set down with my Father in *his* throne. Before I leave this subject let me say that the talk about Christ as a King ruling over his ransomed people, is not good divinity, not the divine aspect of things. The redeemed from among men are at present members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones; they form the body of Christ, and the temple of the Holy Ghost. They suffer with Him now, that they may reign with Him hereafter. They are to be judges and rulers of the world, sharing as glorified Queen with the great King, in all the imperialism and grandeur of power.

The tabernacle of David is more comprehensive than our friend imagines. It cannot be separated from country or people, from throne temple, or priesthood. It was said to the Jews, "Behold your *house* is left unto you desolate," but hope was left as a star to burn in the darkness. "Ye shall not see me again till ye say blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Jerusalem was the special house of reference—the house of the people or nation. But when the period of restoration arrives, even Jerusalem shall be called the throne of the Lord. "At that time they shall call Jerusalem the THRONE OF THE LORD, and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the Lord to Jerusalem; neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart. In those days the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel, and they shall come together out of the land of the north, to the land that I have given for an inheritance to your father, Jeremiah iii, 17 and 18." There is in Ezekiel an account of a magnificent temple which has not yet been seen on the face of the earth. The prophet who had seen the

lingering glory slowly departing from the old house, is permitted fourteen years after to have a vision of its return. "And behold the glory of the God of Israel came from the way of the east, and his voice was like the noise of many waters, and the earth shined with his glory . . . So the spirit took me up, and brought me into the inner court, and behold, the glory of the Lord filled the house. And I heard him speaking unto me out of the house. . . Son of man, the PLACE OF MY THRONE, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever, and my holy name shall the house of Israel no more defile." xliii. 1—7.

When David was settled in his kingdom one of the memorable things which he did was to prepare a place for the ark of God, and pitch a tent or tabernacle for it. The work was finished, and the ark deposited in the prepared place amid solemnities of sacrifice and song, over which the king presided. It came afterward into his mind to build an house which might supersede the moveable tent. Nathan the prophet was sent to him from the Lord with a remarkable message, see 1 Chron. xvii chap. A few of the pregnant statements we may quote "Also I will ordain a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, and they shall dwell in their place, and shall be *moved no more*." "Furthermore I tell thee that the Lord will build thee an house." "I will raise up thy seed after thee which shall be of thy sons, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build me an house, and I will establish his throne for ever." "I will settle him in my house and in my kingdom for ever; and his throne shall be established for evermore." The meditation of David on the message is equally remarkable, and one verse in it, when faithfully rendered from the Hebrew, intimates distinctly that the last great king of David's line would be divine as well as human, and, by consequence, eclipse all former glory. "Thou hast spoken of thy servant's house for a great while to come, and hast regarded me according to the estate of a man who is as high as Jehovah—God." The sum of the matter is according to Zechariah.

"Behold the man whose name is the BRANCH, and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord. Even he shall build the temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne, and he shall be a priest upon his throne." vi. chap. In fine—the last and greatest of the David line was raised from the dead by the power of God; and one of the purposes for which he was raised is to restore the throne and build again the tabernacle of David. Country and people—monarchy and temple—and priesthood—all wait for the breath of his life, and the revelation of his power. "And he shall send Jesus Christ which before was preached unto you—whom the heaven must receive (retain)—until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began." The context shews us in what relation he will stand to the Hebrew nation at that second revelation—like Moses their prophet, and lawgiver. They may blaspheme him and escape now, but at that time every soul refusing to hear him, will be destroyed from among the people.

G. GREENWELL.

REMARKS.

In October, we inserted an article from E. Evans, entitled the "Fallen Tabernacle of David Restored. In December appeared a paper by G. Greenwell upon the same subject, scarcely intended as a reply, but stating an opposite view, and alluding to the article by E. E., who replies in our present issue. G. G. also has concluded to pay further attention to the first article and hence the foregoing—his second and concluding paper. He intimates that he has now said all he intends to say in reply, being

willing that E. E. shall close the discussion in another article. It is, then, to be understood that the writers of the foregoing two articles, were each unacquainted with the writing of the other.

We have no desire to enter into the matter as it stands between our two friends, but a word in regard to the note, on page 16, seems desirable to prevent mistakes on the part of readers not acquainted with the facts. The note says that the clause in Acts xv., beginning with, "*After this*" is not found in Amos, but that James, by inspiration, supplies it. Upon turning to Amos we find the words "In that day will I raise up the Tabernacle of David," in place of "After that I will return and will build again the Tabernacle of David." The Hebrew of Amos and the Greek of James shew the same difference of wording. But on turning to the Septuagint, which the Apostles at times quoted in preference to the Hebrew, the text stands as given by James, shewing that he quoted the Greek version of Amos, and that, therefore, the translators by some means, got that very reading, three hundred years before James derived it from the same fountain of inspiration from which Amos had it. But whether we take the Hebrew or the Greek, the sense is the same. "*In that Day*" and "*After this,*" alike refer to things before spoken by Amos, and must be so applied.—Ed.

FOG.

To the Editor of the *British Harbinger*.—Dear Brother.—An article in the *Harbinger*, for December, signed by Brother Greenwell, begins with noticing a former article, sent to the November *Harbinger*, from a brother at Lincoln, on the Tabernacle of David, and it contains the following sentence. "The district of the fens is not renowned for clear thinking on that or any other subject." Br. G. also gives among other principles of interpretation, the following:—"God speaks to man as men speak to each other, in natural and literal language, and the literal construction is always the right and proper one, unless it involves an impossibility."

Now, these two quotations and the remarks that follow them, afford a very curious psychological study. They supply a good illustration of what may well be called *subjective fog*. I will just show this without entering on the merits of the general question discussed by the writers of the two articles.

In the first place G. G. is wrong in his geography. The good city of Lincoln is *not* in the fens. It is situate on the slope of a breezy wold, and lifts itself clear of atmospheric obstructions, and they who live there, look over the flat region of fog land, where the inhabitants half the year look upward in vain. It is a fact in physics that persons in a fog see objects indistinctly, and of exaggerated size and abnormal forms. Objects that are themselves beyond or above the fog, are thus distorted to the persons in the fog. A similar phenomenon has been remarked by mental philosophers. Confusion of intellect causes some persons to say the objects upon which they meditate are distorted, when they are symmetrical, and beautiful when they are ugly. The quality of the mental vision is attributed to the object. This is subjective fog, *e.g.*—E. E., of clear, breezy Lincoln, is supposed by a dweller in fog land to be *not also* but *alone* in the fog.

Now look back at the second quotation, and at a succeeding paragraph on page 411, where the *sinful kingdom* of Amos is interpreted to mean the *Man of Sin*. This is emphasized as to its literality by saying in effect that masculine is *not* feminine, which, considering the whole passage is a remarkable effort at clearness. If an advocate of *literal* interpretation can affirm that "The sinful kingdom" of Amos can so much as have the remotest relation to the anti-christ of G. G., I should not be at all surprised to have it affirmed that a man is a woman. The state of subjective fog is not quite hopeless. G. G. can write and speak on other subjects clearly

and well, so I will hope that he will some day get out of the nether gloom of anti-christian (*i.e.*, pertaining to anti-christ) speculations, and come up to the clear vision of a true interpretation.

N.B. I don't in any way object to G. G.'s canon as quoted, except that its verbiage might be improved; but I would suggest a rule of interpretation that is of equal value, but which some people seem totally to ignore on some subjects. It is that the New Testament writers shall be held to interpret those of the Old where they refer to the same thing, and *not* the reverse. Thus a literal exegesis of Amos shall not be admitted to interpret James, but a literal exegesis of James, not involving absurdity, shall be taken as an authoritative interpretation of Amos. But the illustration I have given of subjective fog is one that professing to give an outline of literal interpretation of the Old Testament, flies to the New Testament passages that say nothing of the subject, and gives a meaning that is not so much as hinted at in the prophecy discussed. Fog! Fog!! But black is not white.

R. HAR.

Wigan, Dec., 1869.

Reviews, Notes, Passing Events, &c.

THE PÆDOBAPTIST GUIDE, ON MODE AND SUBJECT AND BAPTISMAL REGENERATION. By JOHN GUTHRIE, M.A. London: Hamilton Adams.

A NEW Guide, judging from the contrariety of argument in Pædobaptist ranks, is somewhat sorely needed. We fear, however, that M. Guthrie will not help his brethren nor be accepted by any number of them. "*The Pædobaptist Guide*" is rather a pretentious title. The family holding to baby-baptism is rather large. There is the Greek portion, which would repudiate this new guide, if it ever came to know of its existence; because it advocates sprinkling, whereas they declare immersion the only baptism. There are the Roman and Anglican sections. They would repudiate it, if submitted to them; because it denies to baptism all connection with the new birth. Only a few "Nonconformists" would entertain it for an hour, and but very few of that few would consent to it guidance. The book ought to be a good one, for the writer evidently has ability to make a good book did his position allow it to be done. In this instance, too, he gains the advantage of having first published its arguments in the

form of sermons, which were freely answered by an able Baptist opponent, so that in reconstructing his work he had before him some of the best things that could be said on the other side.

There is really nothing new in the book, so far as its leading features are concerned. *Baptizo*, in the New Testament, with our author, "no more means to *sprinkle* than it does to *dip*." "There it has no model meaning at all." "It may fairly be represented by the word *purify*." In sacred usage its *literal* sense is that of "ordinantial purification." Now, Dr. Beecher, long ago, urged *purify* as the meaning of *baptizo*, but only to be laughed out of court. The mistake consists in confounding the design of the action, or its supposed design, with the action itself. What baptism is *for* has nothing whatever to do with what baptism *is*. *Sprinkling* might be commanded in order to healthful or ceremonial purification, but the word would not change its meaning and become, in import, one and the

same with the word *purify*. A governor might ordain a periodical sprinkling in order to a certain ceremonial purification. That sprinkling would then be "ordinantial purification," but the ordinance could never be observed by dipping, notwithstanding that dipping might far better represent purification.

On the *design* of baptism, Mr. Guthrie is in Egyptian darkness. To get rid of clear Scripture testimony he applies to Baptism in

the Holy Spirit all the allusions to baptism found in the Epistles. He clearly shows that as he knows not what water baptism is, nor what it is for, so he has yet to learn what baptism in the Holy Spirit is, and the design thereof.

We should be happy to exchange with Mr. Guthrie a series of letters upon the design of baptism, and to publish them in this periodical or share with him the responsibility of separate publication.

REMOVED TO WHERE THERE IS NOT A CHURCH.

THE Annual Meeting, held last August in Liverpool, found reported in the schedules nearly one hundred members removed to places where there are not Churches of the Primitive Faith and Order. Nearly all of them would be considered as no longer under Church oversight. They will not be counted in subsequent reports. We wish to submit a question and offer a word of caution.

THE QUESTION.

Should those removed brethren be returned as no longer members of the Churches from which they have, in respect to residence, removed?

Would it not be proper to hold them in membership in the one Church till they are transferred to another, or, to say the least, so long as they manifest desire to maintain the association and attend to such acts of fellowship as are possible in their circumstances? We think so. What we mean by continuing in fellowship, when too far distant to assemble, consists in three particulars—correspondence, contribution, occasional visits when circumstances permit. Why should not each Church fix a day, say quarterly, for reading letters from such distant members, the deacons to receive in such letters, stamps, or post-office orders, according to the prosperity of each; that thus real fellowship (partnership, joint partici-

pation) in the benevolent and other enterprizes of the Church may be enjoyed. The letters thus sent should be handed to suitable brethren, that words of consolation and exhortation, according to the requirement of each, might be forwarded. In the event of an absent one refusing thus to keep up intercourse with the Church, his refusal should be taken as proof of disregard for communion with the Lord's people, and his membership thereupon terminate. The Churches would then embrace some who could but rarely or never attend, but none who manifest complete indifference to communion with the people of God. Should not this plan, or something like it, be invariably acted upon?

THE CAUTION.

Even with such help as suggested by the foregoing, removal to where there is not a Church must be of the nature of a calamity; excepting only to the few who have ability and force of character to make it certain that a Church will result from their removal. How careful, then, ought every one to be in this matter! There are thousands able to stand while in the enjoyment of actual contact with loving brethren and Church ordinances who would as certainly fall away if left to stand alone. Yet it often occurs that superior worldly condition is deemed

sufficient inducement to leave a town where there is a Church for one where there is not, or, when thus compelled to leave, to remove to where there is no Church, when it would have been possible to find a locality which affords opportunity for regular attendance upon the appointed means of grace: 'Too often the loss is not understood until it is experienced. A letter just to hand indicates what some feel when thus removed.

"Dear brother in Christ—Having left and come to——, I now realize the heart's sorrow in not being able to meet at the gathering of saints upon the first day of the week. That blessed ordinance of our Saviour's seems more heavenly now I cannot attend to it; and when I read Paul's exhortation not to forsake the assembling of the saints, my spirit seems to rebound and tell me I have taken a false step in coming out here. Surely brethren would not be so careless as some are if they did but realize what it is to be unable to attend the joys of that blessed gathering! 'Meet and remember me'—the cross, the grave, the skies—meet to remember the peace from Calvary's cross

till He come, and then He will bring peace again to our weary souls. Truly, I can contemplate all these here and gain fresh courage and comfort by so doing, but still not like the joys that spring from participating in the order of God's house. When I was with the Church I had the privilege of engaging in work that has to do with souls, but here, amid this worldly Christianity, I know not how to begin. We need to be earnest for that kingdom of heaven which God has set up and for that righteousness which alone will shelter a man from shame and everlasting contempt. It matters not with the many, in this age of spiritual dearth, for the worship of God to be right so long as it is pleasing to the taste, &c. Alas! for the religion of Jesus to be put on one side for man's tradition."

Reader! suffer the word of exhortation—mind how you consent to go where there is no Church! Take care how, in any degree, you diminish spiritual privileges for worldly gain! You may be compelled to go, and then may expect the blessing of God to go with you. But I pray you take care how you give up the ordinances of God for any earthly consideration whatever! D. K.

PAUL AND ANANIAS.

THE conduct of the apostle Paul in his treatment of Ananias, as recorded in Acts xxiii. 3—5, has been much censured by many. Such have denounced him as not only discourteous but positively wicked in saying to the high priest, "Thou whited wall," which was equivalent to charging him with hypocrisy. Others, who are not so severe in their judgment, are still much troubled with the attitude which Paul manifested. A little consideration of the facts in the case, as well as knowledge of the historical incidents of the day, will not only justify the proceedings of the apostle, but will commend him to our admiration for his moral courage.

When pleading before the council Paul declared that he had lived in all good conscience before God. "Ananias commanded them that stood by to smite him on the mouth."

This was a symbolical method of charging the speaker with falsehood, and of enjoining silence. Paul expresses his prophetic judgment on such injustice and tyranny, saying, "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall." The reason for this utterance was that Ananias, whilst professing as the high priest to administer the law was using his station to play the tyrant by thus commanding Paul to be smitten contrary to the law. Upon this severe rebuke those who stood by said, "Revilest thou God's high priest?" This, indeed, would have been a most grievous offence. To ward off even the suspicion that he could thus treat the official representative of God, then said Paul, "I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest." How is this? Was he in ignorance that Ananias presided in that council as the high priest? No. He well knew in what

capacity he claimed to sit there, and therefore his language was the keenest of satire. I am not ignorant that he claims to be the high priest, but is he really so? He has obtruded himself into that seat, not being the high priest, and therefore in calling him a "whited wall," I have not spoken disrespectfully of the high priest, but have torn off the mask from one who claims a most honourable station that is not his.

The historical facts are as follow: Ananias had been high priest some years before, but had been sent to Rome a prisoner, under charges of misconduct; and, although he was acquitted, still he was not re-instated, but one Jonathan had been appointed in his room. This Jonathan had been murdered, and one named Israel appointed in his stead, but he had not yet taken possession of his office. It was in this interval of vacancy that Ananias pushed himself forward to preside as high priest in this council before which Paul was pleading. These facts being

known the apostle might well call him a "whited wall," and say, "I wist not, brethren, that *he* was the high priest." Every word is pointed. And that he intended to expose this usurper is the more evident from what he adds, "For it is written, thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people." It is the opinion of the learned Michaelis, that Ananias had hurried into and presided at that council without putting on or bearing with him the insignia of his former office. This made the keen language of Paul the more pointed. "Thou claimest to be the high priest, and yet thou appearest without the appointed insignia of office! Where are these? Thou hast not even the external evidence of the office assumed." About five years after this his house was burned in a tumult raised by his own son. He was besieged, and taken in the royal palace, where, having in vain attempted to hide himself, he was dragged out and slain.—*Quiver*.

QUERIES ON BAPTISM.

Editor B. H.—Are faith, repentance, and baptism, essential to salvation, or remission of sins? If so, can there be Christians without baptism? If there are Christians without baptism, then does it not follow that baptism never was essential to remission? I once heard an esteemed Evangelist say that "there were Christians who did not see it their duty to be baptized." X.

REMARKS.

The Evangelist referred to goes beyond *The Book*. We are apt to use the word Christian too widely and in an unscriptural way. We talk of Christian Books, Christian Chapels, Christian Churches, but there is no shade of Bible authority for such use of the word. The term is only used in the Bible to designate those who, on confession of faith, have been baptized into the name of Christ. Let the Evangelist in question, and all others who profess to care for pure speech,

use it only in the same manner and then there will be no dispute or trouble about it. As to what may be essential to salvation, in certain cases, we know not. But he who undertakes to tell us which of God's commands are essential and which are not, sets himself to accomplish a fearful task. *Pardon and the name of Christ* are consequents of baptism administered to a proper subject. That God cannot pardon without baptism we do not say. No man knows that he has received pardon otherwise than as God has appointed. When a woman is married into the name of her husband, it is lawful to call her by his name, but there is no authority for so calling her till then. When a re-begotten sinner is baptized into Christ's name, then, but not till then, it is proper to designate him by the name into which he

is baptized—then, but not till then, have we Bible authority to apply the name Christian. We are certainly of opinion that God will pardon, under this dispensation, some who have not understood his requirement as to baptism. But every such case belongs to the uncovenanted and unrevealed mercy of God. We

never can know in any instance that it is really so, and therefore, so far as fellowship and the right to bear the name of Christ are concerned we cannot accord them, in any such case, without a presumptuous liberty-taking in divine things—an intruding into what does not belong to us. Ed.

QUERIES.—TESTING OF LANDMARKS.

A GENTLEMAN in New Zealand, who is not connected with any church in our fellowship, favours us with some ten pages of small writing, for the most part based upon certain answers to "a lover of peace," in our issue of last July. As they are not in the form of an argument, refer in part to local circumstances which would be out of place here, and as we have not space at command, we cite his queries for brief answers. He writes:—

"But further, you go on to say, 'It is quite clear that men expelled by the church on account of sin may combine with others who do not understand the case and set up a table in opposition to the church which administered the law of the Lord in righteous judgment. This society . . . should be rejected by the church everywhere.' Here, my dear sir, I presume no right-thinking man could disagree with you, but there is an antithesis to this, which is equally right to suppose, namely, that a church might separate those from her communion against whom *no sin* is chargeable. I should have been glad had you given your mind upon such a case—how such a society should be treated, and how she and her decisions stand in the sight of heaven—whether as a church to whose decisions we should bow, and with whom we should seek or have fellowship—or as a synagogue of Satan, that ought to be shunned by all Christian assemblies? It is perfectly possible that a number of brethren may get dissatisfied and go away and set up another meeting, and that which dissatisfied them may be both right and Scriptural—then they are schismatics: but the reverse is equally possible, namely, that procedure may be had recourse to which would render it necessary that sincere, godly, and intelligent men should withdraw from such communion, or that their attachment to truth would provoke such an assembly to

put them away—in that case, I ask, would not the church be schismatic in her conduct?"

The foregoing is so put as to indicate the true answers—1. If a church separate members against whom *no sin* is chargeable, that church sins by so doing. 2. What, then, should be done by a brother who *certainly knows* that such is the case, or by a church possessing such knowledge? The offending church should be called upon to repent, and should be disowned if the sin be persisted in. 3. Who should thus judge and disown? The brother for himself, or the church for itself, by whom it is thus certainly known. But let us be guarded. Before a member can be properly excluded his sin must be defined, charged upon him, and proved to the satisfaction of the church—that is, to the satisfaction of a majority of members legitimately assembled. The alleged sin being condemned by the law of God and the offender proved guilty, as above intimated, it will not do for some individual to set himself above the assembly, whose right it is to judge, and to say, I *know* the man is not guilty, nor for some other church, upon an *ex parte* statement, to impose its counter decision. If the excluding church only charge the man with an offence that does not warrant exclusion, then there is ground for action, because a condition of membership is thus imposed which is not constitutional. 4. Of course it is possible for a church thus to violate its God-given con-

stitution, and in that case the protestant section failing to reclaim is bound to withdraw, and, however small, it stands as the church. But no separation in this way can be lawful where those who withdraw admit the church-state of those who remain.

"You speak of 'things not settled by divine law but left open for regulation according to the will of the church.' Here I cannot understand you, as you have not specified, nor can I conceive of things 'to be regulated by the will of the church,' nor of anything that she has to give apart from 'divine law!' One other question I would ask. If the church of God separate persons from its communion, is it bound to keep their conduct secret or private, so that the world may not know it? I am quite ready to admit that the world, or those outside the pale of the church, should not have anything to do in guiding its decisions, but this is wholly apart from my question."

There are many things not settled by the law of the Lord. The hour of the day at which we shall break the bread, the place of meeting, what hymns we shall sing, how and at what stage of the meeting we shall contribute of our substance, &c. These the church has to adjust as it may deem expedient. But about such like matters a man can become so factious as to persistently violate

the law of love and keep the church in discord. In such case he must be admonished, entreated, and, if he will not desist, withdrawn from as one who tramples upon the "*Royal Law*."

If a church exclude a member is it bound to keep the fact secret? Certainly not; and it may be preferable that the fact be made known. On the other hand, the church is not bound to publish the fact. The Bible contains no law touching the measure of publicity in such cases. Neither is the church bound in the least degree as to the amount of information it shall give to outsiders. It may be expedient in some cases to give much, in others less, and in others none. But in each case the church is the judge of what is expedient, and, whether it give or withhold, it violates no law. A non-member has a perfect right to ask information, if he consider that he may be affected by the particulars of the case, but he has no right to demand what he asks for. In most cases, one would think, the church would gladly give the desired particulars, but we can easily conceive of circumstances where discretion requires silence. Ed.

REPORT ON CHRISTIAN UNION.

CHRISTIAN union with us is a common topic. It has seemed as though it belonged almost exclusively to us, for very rarely, indeed, have others appeared disposed to meddle with it. The last ten years, however, have much changed the state of the case, and our neighbours now can appoint committees, draft reports, and enlarge upon the need for organic union. During a recent session of the Old School Presbyterian Synod of Cincinnati, the subject of Christian Union was introduced by a memorial, and a committee was appointed to consider it. From the report of that committee we extract the following:—

In the estimation of your committee God requires the organic union of all believers living in the same neighbourhood. At present we propose to express no opinion on the subject of a wider union. God requires no union of Christ and Belial. . . .

God requires no union which restricts the right of private judgment or Christian liberty of speech. That is the union of the Roman Catholic Church.

All who live in the same community, and who give to each other Scriptural evidence that they are true believers, should unite in the same church organization.

I. Christ prayed for such a union as necessarily involves this organic union.

1. He prayed for oneness in heart, faith and hope. His prayer has not been fully answered in behalf of the Presbyterian Church, the Methodist Church, or any other, but it has been so far answered as to make organic union obligatory on the members of

each of these churches, and when it is answered in behalf of all Christians the organic union is obligatory upon all.

2. Christ prayed for a oneness which should be as the oneness of the Father and Son.

But Christians who can not commune at the same table, pray in the same prayer-meeting, teach in the same Sabbath school, and be enrolled in the same congregation, are not in any adequate sense one as the Father and the Son are one.

3. Christ prayed for a union which should convince the world that he was the Son of God and the Saviour of men. But when Christians, living in the same neighbourhood, can not live together in the same church, then invisible oneness fails to convince the world.

II. The Apostles were divinely inspired and commissioned to organize the Christian Church, but they organized but one church in any one place.

The diversities in social life, in education, and in religion itself before conversion, in Apostolic times, were much greater than in this land and at this time.

III. The divisions in the Christian Church give great advantages to false churches and to infidels.

Rome plausibly affirms that she is the true Church and that the Protestant Church is the false Church, because she is

united and the Protestants are divided. . .

IV. These divisions shamefully waste the labour and the means of the Christian Church.

Three or four churches are built, and three or four ministers maintained, in a thousand localities where one church would be more efficient than the three or four.

V. These divisions make home evangelization almost impossible. The unconverted population is, itself, so sectarian, that the Evangelist can reach but an inconsiderable fraction of the population in almost any locality in our large towns and cities.

Your committee respectfully submit that when true Christians set up diverse church organizations in the same neighbourhood, that is schismatical; and wherever men do this, who mutually recognize each other as true disciples, they are self convicted of schism.

Schism is a sin, and calls for immediate repentance and reformation, that this land may be saved from Romanism on the one hand, and infidelity on the other, and that the world may be converted unto God.

The report was cordially indorsed by Dr. Thomas, of Dayton, and was approved by other members, but was not adopted by the Synod. It was recommitted to the committee to report next year,

BIBLE IN CHINA.

A BROTHER in writing from Kentucky University to the *Apostolic Times*, and who has returned from China, says:—"You are aware that China is divided into eighteen provinces, estimated to contain four hundred millions, and that it is as far from North to South as from Boston to New Orleans. The open ports, in addition to those mentioned, are those up the Great River; the farthest, Hawkow, seven hundred miles, Chefow, at the entrance to the Gulf of Pechili on the North, and Teintsin, just below the capital.

Ambassadors reside in Peking, and missionaries do also by courtesy. The open ports, then, might be compared to our Atlantic seaboard cities and St. Louis, with mission stations at each, and out-stations near by, but leaving the great interior unevangelized, except by a few such

men as Mr. Wylie, agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society. These are the regions beyond the ordinary missionary efforts. Regions where are great cities like Peking, whose names you have never heard, provinces, where the foot of missionary or traveller has seldom trod; where the people turn out by thousands to see, for the first time, the dress and face of the European; where cities are moved at your coming, and from the governor of the province to the beggar by the wayside, all are eager to get a copy of the Book which says:—"Ta shi dzu shi shante twanza tein ti," which is "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," when they exclaimed, "*Ta shu, san, shu, mi ibon, kong kong,*" meaning, "tis a great book, a good book; let us buy one and examine it." Regions where the exciting scenes

and circumstances that surround the pioneer preachers of other ages, at once are yours; where the precious promises of the Book divine are drawn in lines of living light upon the soul; where privation is pleasure and death disarmed; where the soul, still looking forward, bursts forth,

Bright regions beyond far away,
Where the light of his love is unknown.
Where night is without any day,
There let me establish his throne.

PAUL BAGLEY.

KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY, NOV., 1869.

THE NEW HYMN BOOK.—PRAYING TO THE SPIRIT.

Editor B. H.—From the preface to the Hymn Book, just published by you, I notice that you anticipate some measure of fault-finding as part-payment of the large labour you have expended in the preparation of this volume. Now, I am not going to have a share in this fault-finding, but there is one hymn, the 344th, commencing

"Gracious Spirit! dwell with me,"

which is throughout a series of invocations to the Holy Spirit, and all I have to ask is—Scriptural authority for this.

Australia. Faithfully yours, M.

REMARKS.

The Hymn referred to, received, perhaps, more consideration than any other in the Selection. We were not willing to omit it unless compelled, as in some respects it is a gem, and it cannot be feelingly used without spiritual benefit. Friend M. describes it, as, throughout, a series of invocations to the Holy Spirit. But its author, we have good reason to conclude, did not consider himself as addressing the Spirit of God at all. Gracious Spirit, Truthful Spirit, Tender Spirit Spirit, and Holy Spirit, are with him, in this hymn, subjective and describe the renewed Spirit of the Christian. The burden of the hymn, as originally intended, relates to the Mind which was in Christ. It asks that it may continue—that is dwell—in that child of God who adopts the language of the hymn. But though deeming this its import, we foresaw, that

many would take the last line of the last verse as referring to *The Holy Spirit* and, therefore, thought it better to give it in that section of the book which would suggest that reading. But before admitting it we carefully pondered the question—Is it, under all circumstances, necessarily wrong for a Christian to sing

"Holy Spirit! dwell with me,
I, myself, would holy be!"?

Our conclusion was, and is, that we are not authorized to pray to the Holy Spirit, but should pray to the Father, in the name of the Son, about the Spirit. Yet that, taking in view the licence granted to song and poetry generally, in the Bible, as elsewhere, we could use the lines in question without considering ourselves as really addressing the Spirit in prayer. We thus call upon trees to clap their hands; upon harvests to upon flourish; upon seas to be calm; storms to lull; without for a moment supposing that trees, seas, &c., are objects of worship, and without forgetting that they do nothing but by the will of our Heavenly Father. We find, then, no difficulty in saying, "Holy Spirit! dwell with me" which, without going beyond ordinary poetic licence, means—I do desire that the Spirit which dwells with God's people may ever remain with me.

Ed.

ITEMS OF NEWS.

BIRMINGHAM.—We are glad to report further progress in the Churches here. Since November thirteen persons have put on the Lord Jesus and been added to the

Church, and one, formerly baptized, received from the Plymouth Brethren. The interest in our Chapel and Cottage-meetings is considerable, giving promise of

immediate fruit. Br. King, in addition to his Lord's-day labours, has been directing attention Christward by means of a series of popular lectures upon the Church of the past, present, and future. The causes leading to the failure of the religious organizations of the day, Protestant and Roman Catholic, have been exhibited, and the opportunity for "relevant questions" by the audience has given rise to a healthy ventilation of the topics on hand, which we hope will result in an enlargement of the Church.

We have been favoured by a visit from G. Greenwell, of Liverpool. He discoursed to the Brethren in their respective meetings during the week, to their edification and comfort, besides proclaiming the glorious Gospel to sinners on the evenings of the First-days. The Brethren generally express their delight at meeting and hearing him once more. May the good Lord help us all to benefit by these ministrations of his word and to engage more actively in the work of salvation. J. ADAMS.

DARWIN.—Considerable commotion has arisen in this place consequent upon lectures by Infidels. Messrs. Bradlaugh and Watts have given visits, and the local papers intimated that D. King, of Birmingham was expected to meet Mr. Bradlaugh in debate. This led to the insertion of letters, from Mr. King, in the *Blackburn Times*, in which he exposed his former experiences with the aforesaid worthies, and intimated willingness still to meet Mr. B. upon certain reasonable terms. Large placards have been posted on both sides, and the matter is not yet finally settled, but the shuffling on the part of Mr. Bradlaugh is in keeping with the past. There have been given away at the lectures 1,000 copies of the exposure of the Newcastle proceedings, printed in four pages. Next month we may say more.

SOUTHPORT.—We are glad to report that after some weeks' special effort, with the help of Mrs. Hindle, M'Dougall and Strang, our hearts have been made glad in seeing the Saviour honoured by four confessing their faith, and putting Him on in the ordinance of Baptism. There are others enquiring the way. T. R.

BLACKBURN.—Since last report four have been added to the Church by baptism and one restored. There is much enquiry, and we expect good results. H. M.

CHILSEA.—Since the opening of the new Chapel the bath has been used for sixteen immersions. S.

SHEFFIELD.—A small Church of five members has been now some time meeting in the house of a brother in Sheffield. Is it not time that something be done in this large town?

WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND.—You will

be glad to learn that there are a few Disciples of Jesus in this town endeavouring to walk in His own appointed way. Our number at present is only five, we meet together on the Lord's-day to remember His dying love. There is a good field here for an Evangelist, but it is the cry all over the world. The harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few. But we pray and hope for better times. The day may shortly come when the Lord will send some servant among us, who will contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints.

G. GRAY.

CARLTON, VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA.—You will be glad to know that the Gospel has lost none of its power. Weekly evidence is given by young and old yielding to the Saviour. T. J. Gore is with us on a visit from Adelaide. He preached to a large and attentive audience in Lygon street Chapel. Subject "the Philosophy of Conversion." The services are well attended both at the Chapel and Forrester's Hall. The young in the vicinity of both meeting places, as well as the children of the members of the Church, about 200 in Lygon street and upwards of 100 in the Hall are being taught on Lord's-day morning and afternoon. Several additions have been made to the Church from the School. C. G. LAWSON.

RICHMOND, AUSTRALIA.—It will be pleasing to all who rejoice in the liberty of the gospel to know that the truth is winning souls to the Saviour. The following is an account of the commencement and progress of the work of the Lord in this place.—Twelve brethren residing in or near Richmond, with our esteemed Br. Hammil, being desirous to establish the Church in this place, met at Br. Bell's house in April, and unanimously resolved to meet there for worship on Lord's mornings until a suitable place be got for proclaiming the gospel. In June we rented the building lately used by the Presbyterians, Lennox Street, for Lord's-days only, and there Br. Hammil preached the word to a very fair audience. He also visited the people and distributed tracts, being, upon the whole, favourably received. In July, for some reason unknown, we received notice the we could not have the building after 18th. instant. But we secured a spacious building (adjoining) in which place we still meet. We had, on six consecutive evenings, discourses by Brethren from Melbourne and surrounding Districts, all of which were very well attended. Our increase is, by confession and baptism *twenty-seven*; by commendation, including first twelve, *nineteen*, making a total of *forty six*. Thus we have reason to thank God and take courage. A Sunday School has been opened which bid fair for a success.

R. STAGGARD.

DUNEDIN, OTAGO.—That part of the one

body congregated in Dunedin, I rejoice to say has of late emerged from the inert state, to one of more activity and importance. this has been brought about by the aid of Evangelistic labour. First H. S. Earl came, leaving indelible marks behind him of how the gospel, truthfully stated can impress. Mr. Surber following, in a few months, and gathered in many precious souls; in whom the truth had been ripening. The result of his labours during the short time he remained (three months) was *fifty-seven*, each gladly yielding to the Lord. A week after his departure we had the pleasure of receiving Theodore Wright, who at the present time is labouring to win souls to Christ. Our hearts have been gladdened by receiving *fourteen* additions as the result of his ministration—eleven by baptism and three from the Baptists who prefer our Scriptural fellowship. I trust our gracious Father will long continue to us peace and prosperity, and that the same may be extended to the Churches in every place.

F. BATTISON.

NORTHDOWN, TASMANIA.—Myself and wife arrived here four years ago. We were afterwards joined by a brother and his wife. Then we immersed one into Christ. Now we number six. We cannot learn that there are any more in the Island. We do what we can in preaching and we desire an interest in the prayers of the brotherhood. We are thankful for the kindness of some one who sends us the *B. H.*, and hope it will continue.

R. C. FAIRLAM.

The following are from the "*The Australian Christian Pioneer*."

ADELAIDE.—*White's Rooms*, September 24.—During the past month *fifteen* have been added to the Church. During my absence at Willunga T. J. Gore preached at *White's Rooms* most acceptably and efficiently. Love, peace, and prosperity still attend us as a Church.

H. S. EARL.

WILLUNGA.—During the past month the work of the Lord has been carried on by T. J. Gore, T. Porter, and H. S. Earl. The interest awakened last month has been kept up and increased. Never before has there been such a thorough religious awakening in this town and neighbourhood. The Scriptures have been diligently searched, and the great topics of Christianity have been discussed with deep earnestness, Aug. 21 and 22, at the earnest request of several inhabitants in Noarlunga (a town about ten miles distant from Willunga), I delivered two lectures on Baptism. We had crowded and attentive audiences, and not a few were convinced of the duty and privilege of the believer to be 'buried with Christ in baptism.' On the afternoon of the following day 1 baptized *six* believers 'in the name of the Lord Jesus,' and notwithstanding it was a week-

day we had a large number present to witness the solemn ordinance. In the evening the Church held a business meeting, and it was unanimously resolved that steps should be taken to erect, as soon as possible, a suitable house of worship for the Church of Christ at Willunga. A fine building-site for the Chapel was donated, and a considerable sum of money was subscribed towards the proposed object. We hope soon to see a large and suitable Chapel erected at Willunga. During the past month *eighteen* have been added to the Church by faith and baptism. Several have decided for Christ, and others are 'not far from the kingdom.' H. S. EARL.

HINDMARSH, September 25.—Since last month's report two have been added to the Church in this place. On Tuesday, 21, of September, we held our third anniversary tea meeting. Between three and four hundred sat down to tea. Thomas Magarey presided over a truly happy and profitable meeting.

T. PORTER.

MILANG, September 20.—Our hearts have been made glad in beholding the power of the Gospel of Christ in bringing sinners to himself. *Seven* persons since our last report, '*hearing, believed and were baptized*.' Many more are interested and inquiring and the prospects for further additions to the fold of Christ are good. Our trust is in God, and in the power of his Word. We have much pleasure in testifying to the usefulness of Br. Carr's little book, being 'A reply to the Rev. James Ballantyne's tract on Baptism.' It is doing a *good work* for us and with the blessing of God will yet convince thousands.

S. JUDD.

TWO WELLS, September 28.—The Church of Christ in this place has been cheered by *eight* additions to her communion during the month. These all on confession of faith in the Saviour have acknowledged His lordship in turning to Him, obeying from the heart that form of doctrine once delivered to the saints. We number now in Church fellowship *fifty three members*; the meetings are well attended, and great interest is taken in the word of God, for which we plead. A cry is going through the land that we are to be dreaded and avoided, and this arises out of our determination to abide by what is written, *we will speak of Bible things in Bible words*; and because we will leave Bible things where the Bible leaves them; because we will have an infallible guide in preference to a fallible one; the incorruptible seed to the mixed article, which in effect says, 'We are wiser than what is written.' We hope and labor for the time when all the followers of the one Lord will speak a pure language.

BEAUMARIS VICTORIA.—On Thursday 18, September, six candidates were baptized. These are all the fruit of Sunday School

labour. Let Sunday School teachers take courage, and not become weary in well doing, ever remembering that in due season we shall reap if we faint not.—W. RUSE.

DONCASTER, BULLEEN,—Sept. 20. On Monday last five young people (all from Templestowe), were baptized in the presence of many witnesses.

MELBOURNE, September 21.—Twenty-two have been added to the Church of Christ in this city since last report. Of these, one was by commendation, and twenty-one upon the confession of faith in Christ, were immersed into his death. The audiences which attend to hear the preaching of Christ and Him crucified, continue large and attentive and the interest is unabated.—A. T. M.

Obituary.

JANET LAWSON fell asleep in Christ, at Carlton, Victoria, August 23, 1869, in her eighty-third year, having been baptized into Christ in 1858. She evinced the spirit of a disciple, enjoyed the divine means of edification, and rejoiced in the hour of her departure. G. G. L.

CAM-YE ALYN ROSSETT.—Another ripe sheaf for the Master's Garner. SISTER CHAPMAN fell asleep in Jesus, Nov. 11th, 1869, aged eighty-four years. Immersed in 1838, and from that time a consistent follower of Jesus. W. G.

MARY HOLLAND, widow, aged sixty years, a member of the Church, in Lincoln, fell asleep in Jesus, October 30th, 1869. She was seized with Paralysis, which rendered her unconscious, in which state she remained some twelve days and then expired.

The Family Room.

A LEAF FROM KITTY'S DIARY.

"EARLY as I awoke this morning, the birds were awake before me. First came the cawing of the busy rooks, from their nests in the elms, far above the roof; then the twittering of the sparrows, in the white thorn under my window.

I felt so happy as I looked out on the humble creatures, all sending up their incense of content to God, that my eyes filled with tears, and I knelt and said aloud the Lord's Prayer, and then I said in my heart:—

'Dear creatures of God, ye seem never able to utter what ye would of His praise; and yet ye do not know half His goodness—not half what we know; ye bask in the light of His smile; but we know the secret love of His heart. Ye praise Him for the overflowing riches, which cost Him nothing; we praise Him for the sacrificing love, which cost Him His Son. The earth is full of thy riches; but we only know, Our Saviour, the love of thy poverty and thy cross.'

And as I opened my window, I thought, "Jesus my sun, I open my heart to Thee! Let thy light and thy spirit flow into my soul, as thy light

and air into my chamber." And was not the pure cold water one of His own consecrated images? And did not the very clothes I put on recall the white robes, made white as no fuller on earth can white them, in a fountain no hand on earth could open or close? I had no temptation to "light discourse," for Betty had just left the room inside mine, and she is seldom very conversational; and not a creature else, except the birds was awake.

When I was dressed I thought how I might best fulfil the good bishop's directions as to "retiring to my closet." At first I thought I would ask mother to let me clear a small chamber above the apple room. But then I thought, it would be like the Pharisee praying in the corners of the street, to go up there in the sight of all, to perform my devotions; and I should lose the sweet feeling that no one knows what I am doing but God.

So I came to the conclusion that no place could be a better closet than a young maid's chamber like mine, with such sights, and scents, and

sounds, to be had from my casement. My chapter was the first of Matthew, but I did not get beyond the twenty-first verse, because it seemed to me such a wonderful promise that Jesus our Lord will really save us from our sins, from being impatient and discontented, and all the things which make us unhappy. Before I got any further it was high time for me to be going a milking. Therefore I resolved that instead of sitting down to think what temptations were likely to come on me, I would do this on my way to the cliff, to the pasture where the cows are. That was how it happened that my temptations came on me before I had time to think of them, and to guard myself; although, indeed in general, it seems to me the very essence of temptations is that they just come when and where one does not expect them.

On my way to take the milk pail from the dairy, I went to see if some cough syrup I had made for Widow Treffry, and had left to stand there all night, had settled. When I came to the shelf on which I had laid it, it was gone. On my questioning Betty (very gently, I am sure, for it was washing day, and we know she has all her prickles out then), she replied she could not let such rubbish stand by her cream to tempt all the flies in the country. She had put it on the window seat in the kitchen, and the cat had upset it. It was a mercy the cup was not broken, and that the poor cat was not poisoned. She would not have such filthy stuff in her dairy. To which I retorted warmly that I had certainly as much right to the dairy as she had, and that she might have known the cat always sat in the window-sill when there was sunshine.

Betty replied that she was not going to be ordered about by those she had brought up from the cradle; and I retired from the contest worsted, as I might have known I should be,

On my return to my room, before breakfast, I found all my drawers in disorder. On my complaining at the breakfast table Jack laughed, and said he had only been looking for a piece of string, and asked if I intended putting it in my diary.

I coloured, and said he had no right to pry into my drawers, nor indeed to enter my room without permission.

Mother interposed, and said I should not make such a storm about trifles.

And father smiled, and asked me if my diary was to be like that of the citizen in the "Spectator." Monday—Rose and dressed, and washed hands and face. Tuesday—Washed only my hands. I ought to have laughed, but I could not. A profane touch seemed to have brushed the bloom off my new treasure, and so, somewhat heavily, the day passed on.

How very much everything has changed with me since morning. At all events I have no difficulty in finding enough to-night for confession and petition. But to confess truly, I must, I think, be just to myself as well as to others.

I have noticed that sometimes one can fall into a passion of self-accusation, which seems to me no more true repentance than a passion of accusing other people. I think one has no right to rail at one's self any more than any one else. Besides, it seems to me so much easier to burst into a flood of tears and sob, "I am a wretch, a miserable sinner, the chief of sinners," than to say with quiet shame, from one's inmost heart, "I was unjust to Betty to-day; I was cross and selfish with Jack; I was impatient even with dearest mother."

Disappointment and vexation are not repentance. Exaggeration and self-reproach is not confession. In the midst of our tears we secretly congratulate ourselves on our sensibility; or the heart rebounds against the excess of its self-accusa-

tion, and ends by estimating the sin as very little, and its penitence as very great.

No. Before all things I want to be true to myself and to everyone. I want really to overcome my sins—not merely to have the luxury of weeping over them; and therefore I must try to know exactly what they are. It was my hasty temper that led me wrong in all these things. But what makes my temper hasty? *What was it* that Betty touched to the quick in asserting her right over me? I suppose it was my pride.

What made me so angry with Jack? He certainly had no right to appropriate my property; but I had no right to be angry. It must be that I care too much about my

things. What fault is that? Can it be avarice?

And then what made me impatient with mother? I thought she did not justly stand up for my rights.

My dignity! My things! My rights! How mean and selfish it looks!

What could have made me overcome? If I had thought of Betty's rough but most unselfish care over us all these years; if I had loved Jack more than my miserable *things*; if I had loved and honoured mother as I ought, and thought how tenderly faithful her reproofs are, and how I need them.

What I want, then, is love, more love.

Yes, there is enough to confess, and enough to ask pardon for to-night.

GREEDINESS FOR OUR OFFSPRING.

A hindrance toward a just generosity with a certain class, lies in the fact that they want to keep too much of what they get for their children; to leave them a great fortune. But it has been well said by a great German "that wealth bears heavier on talent than poverty," that when the oil of riches is poured on the hot passions of youth, only the noblest and most pure have the power to keep himself from being dragged down, and many a man sees now that he would not, for much money, have had much money in his youth. It is perhaps a nobler passion to save a fortune for our children than it is to spend all we get on ourselves; yet there are very few cases, indeed, in which our children themselves are not worse, instead of better, for such provision. It generally results in a physical, moral and spiritual degen-

eracy. Physical, because the child and youth has never had to work so as to develop, and harden, and brighten his organism. Moral, because the temptations to go wrong, as well as the opportunities, have been thicker about him; and spiritual, because his father, in providing everything that he needs, has stood between him and the sunlight of the good providence which every healthful soul learns to find and trust, through the struggles and victories of early life. "Let me give to my sons," a wise man said once, "a good constitution, good principles, a good trade and a Bible, and that is fortune enough."

It is a great hindrance in some men to a noble giving that they want to save so much for their children. It is sadly certain that such saving seldom does the children any good.

TACT.

Love swings on little hinges. It keeps an active little servant to do a good deal of its fine work. Tact is a nimble-footed and nimble-fingered servant. 'Tact sees without looking,

and has always a good deal of small change on hand; tact carries no heavy weapons, but can do wonders with a sling and stone; tact never runs against a stone wall, but always

finds a sycamore tree up which to climb when things are becoming crowded and unmanageable on the level ground; tact has a wonderful way of availing itself of a word or a smile, or a gracious wave of the hand; tact carries a bunch of curiously fashioned keys, that opens all kinds of doors; tact plants its mono-

syllables wisely, for being a monosyllable itself, it arranges its own order with all the familiarity of friendship; tact, sly, versatile, divining, running, flying, tact governs the world, yet touches the big baby under the impression that it has not been touched at all.

BREVITIES.

Just make up your mind before you start out for home that you will look on the sunniest side of everything, enjoy yourself as much as you possibly can, and use every endeavour to make the journey as pleasant to those around you, and it will be very singular if somebody isn't the better for it!

Our houses and barns we lock and keep in perfect repair, but our bodies and minds are repeatedly robbed and roughly handled before we consent to take like precaution with them.

No school is more necessary to children than that of patience, because either the will must be broken in childhood or the heart in old age.

We often omit the good we might do in consequence of thinking about that which it is out of our power to do.

One of Rutherford's golden sentences gives us the secret of his unusual unction: "The cross gives us much to say."

They are brave who know to speak

For the fallen and the weak;

They are brave who calmly choose

Hatred, scoffing and abuse,

Rather than in silence shrink

From the truth they needs must think;

They are brave who dare to be

In the right with two or three.

Many persons have quickness to discover their faults, with not energy enough to eradicate them.

EDITORIAL.—TO BRETHREN AND CHURCHES.

BELOVED!—Another year's editorial work is at an end, and again *The British Harbinger* greets you, bearing expression of our most hearty longing for your present and eternal welfare. We had concluded to enter upon the new volume without a word in reference to the future, and to leave you to remember our labour of love or to forget our need of increased circulation, as the case may be. But second thoughts remind us that some are deeply interested in these monthly issues, desire to enlarge their circulation, and are anxious to know whether it is well with us, or otherwise. To be brief, then—We cannot record an increase. The subscription list last year was reduced by the birth of the *Australian Christian Pioneer*, which with many in Australia, who cannot afford to take the two, steps into our shoes. This year's list does not in any way recover the lost ground. In several places there is reduction, owing to want of business prosperity; and, upon the whole, we sustain a further reduction, though not considerable. This might be more than recovered if our agents and the officers of Churches were at once to urge the matter upon the brethren generally.

There is but little to be said in reference to the volume of which you have now the first instalment. Competent opponents of leading principles shall have afforded to them equal space with ourselves. Offensive personalities will be carefully excluded. We have congratulations from all directions in regard to the contents of the last volume, but our plans for the present must certainly render the current volume the best, by far, that we have issued, notwithstanding that there are some contemplated improvements which the decrease in circulation must necessarily postpone; for where much labour is given for which there is no compensation, changes which involve increased outlay can be but sparingly undertaken.

We ask special attention to forthcoming articles on MINISTRY. Not merely a reading, but a special investigation of the whole subject. One who has been held in estimation by the brotherhood generally, and who has stood with us from the first, writes—"I observe your notice of promised articles on Ministry, so as to bring into careful survey the duties and relationships of Elders and Evangelists. How necessary and desirable it is, that such should be better understood; especially as to the duties, authority, example, &c., of Elders. You seem to me to take it in hand just at the right time. How strange it is that so little has been said in the *B. H.* upon this subject—so important in its bearing upon the unity and prosperity of the Church."

ED.

MINISTRY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.—No. II.

PRIESTHOOD.

"And Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God."—GEN. xiv.

Thus early in the Bible do we find the priest. He stands before us a priest by divine appointment—as the priest of the God of Heaven. Animal sacrifices were no doubt instituted immediately after the first transgression; and it is most likely that as the human race extended, the head of the family and the chief of the tribe were required to fill the priestly office. But be that as it may, Melchizedek was the king of Salem and the Priest of God. But men wandered from God, set up their own gods, ordained sacrifices for themselves, and made their own priests. Early in the Bible we find traces of this apostacy. On the one hand, we behold worship and priesthood of divine appointment; on the other, will-worship and the unauthorized priest. The true priest and the false priest thus stand face to face upon the sacred page.

When the Patriarchal dispensation gave place to that of Moses, the priesthood underwent considerable change. The head of the family and the chief of the tribe were no longer eligible for priestly functions, but God limited priesthood to one tribe, selecting Aaron and his sons to minister in this holy office. Hence we read, "No man taketh this honor upon himself, but he that is called of God as was Aaron." The priests were few, the people many, but the arrangement was of God, and death was decreed to the man who would deny the priesthood of God's priests by claiming their office for himself or for others. The standing result of a priesthood is, that animal sacrifice is offered in order to approach God; man is not permitted to offer his own sacrifice; the priest stands between him and God, and only by the intervention of the appointed priest can he acceptably draw nigh. Now, though liberty for the sinner to approach by means of victim, altar, and priest is unquestionably a great blessing, it is, nevertheless, small in comparison with that of having at all times, by virtue of one who is both priest and sacrifice and who has ascended to heaven, liberty to approach the throne of Divine Majesty to obtain, without help or hindrance from any being on earth, all required mercy and grace—in other words; to be, each for himself, a priest to God—a nation of priests. Both these positions God has appointed—the *limited* first, the *universal* afterward. To the people of limited priesthood He gave a conditional promise to make them a kingdom of priests—that is, to take away all restriction and constitute every subject of the kingdom a priest to God. This promise is found in Ex. xix., "Therefore if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure to me above all people; for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be to me a KINGDOM OF PRIESTS and an HOLY NATION." The record of the sin and death-punishment of Korah, Dathan, and Company, is found in Num. xvi. The sin consisted in an attempt to change the appointed priesthood—the Lord had instituted a priestly order but Korah proclaimed the nation holy as to priesthood, *i.e.*, universal priesthood. The sin consisted not in an attempt to introduce what was bad in itself, for the Lord had promised that very thing as a blessing, but in the effort to set aside God's then present appointment by the introduction of another, before its time and in the absence of required conditions. The result was death to the entire company.

The nation, however, was not obedient, did not keep the covenant, lost

the blessing, and never became a Kingdom of Priests. But was God's purpose frustrated? Not at all! He constituted another Israel, substituting the FAITH of Abraham for the FLESH of Abraham—not excluding the fleshly seed, but granting alike to Jew and Gentile entrance by the “door of faith” into the newly-constituted kingdom. Hence a new Covenant was made, a new Mediator given, a new Law promulgated, a new Sacrifice provided, and a new Priesthood instituted. That this change has been made is clearly intimated by the Apostle Paul—“If therefore perfection were by the Levitical Priesthood, for under it the people received the law, what further need was there that another priest should arise after the order of Melchizedek and not be called after the order of Aaron, for the priesthood being changed, made of necessity a change also of the law.” Christ then is our only and ever-living High Priest, and in His church all are alike priests, there being no priesthood but that which is common to every Christian. Hence it is written, “Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He has consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh; and having an high-priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water.” Heb. x. 22. Here, then, the Universality of the Priesthood under this Dispensation is clearly stated. As all the priests, and only the priests, under the law, had access to the tabernacle, and as they came by the blood and the altar to the brazen laver, and washed in the water thereof, so Paul calls upon all Christians to approach with boldness, having their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and their bodies washed with pure water, thus making the limited priesthood of the old covenant typical, not of an order of priests, as distinguished from the laity, but of the whole Church of Christ. So too, in Rev. i. 5, 6, where the song of the redeemed declares the universal priesthood, “Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God.” So we read in the Authorized English Version, but according to the *Vatican Manuscript* the reading is still stronger—“Hath made us A KINGDOM, *even* PRIESTS.” It thus appears that the promise made conditionally to the ancient people, and not realized by them on account of disobedience, is fulfilled to the Spiritual Israel, so that now the priesthood is as wide as the kingdom—every subject is a priest—that which Korah sought to proclaim before its time is now proclaimed and established by the Apostles of Jesus. The testimony of Peter is unmistakeable—“As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby: If so be that ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious. To whom coming as to a living stone, disallowed indeed of God and precious, ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, AN HOLY PRIESTHOOD, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.” . . . “But ye are a chosen generation, a ROYAL PRIESTHOOD, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye show forth the praises of God.” 1 Peter ii. 2-9. Thus are applied to the Church of Christ the very terms of the promise given to the people of the former covenant—*Kingdom of Priests—Holy Nation—Peculiar People*. There is, then, now no priesthood but that which is common to all Christians. In other words, *literal* and *limited* priesthood is abolished and only spiritual priests and spiritual sacrifices remain.*

* What are these “spiritual sacrifices” that all the members of the Church of God can now offer without distinction of sex or any restriction whatever? 1. They offer

But plainly as these truths are set forth in the Bible they are not understood by those who are taught by modern priests, because they seek not to obtain the truth directly from the Word of the Lord. They have a notion that the claims of these men are sustained in the New Testament. But, surely, if in our approach to God we are now handed over to priests, as were the whole people under the former dispensation, the fact must appear somewhere in the New Testament. A fact so important must certainly stand out in all clearness. Let us see. In the New Testament the words high-priest and chief-priest, counted together, occur about *one hundred and twenty-three* times (mostly in the Gospels): the whole, with the exception of some *ten* in the Epistle to the Hebrews, are historical allusions to the high-priest and chief-priests of the Jews. The ten excepted instances refer to the Lord Jesus, and present Him as the anti-type of the Jewish high-priest. There is not, then, in all the *one hundred and twenty-three* instances the slightest allusion to a priest in the Church of Christ, save and except the Lord Jesus himself. The word *Priest* occurs in the New Testament some *thirty-three* times, of which *eighteen* refer to Jewish priests, *one* to the priests of Jupiter, *eight* to Christ, *three* to Melchizedek, and *three* designate the entire body of Christ's Church "*Priests unto God*"—Rev. i. 6, v. 10, xx. 6.

The word *Priesthood* occurs some *six* times; *four* times in Heb. vii., all of which refer to the Levitical priesthood or to that of the Lord Jesus himself. The remaining *two* declare the whole Church *the holy and royal priesthood of God*—1 Peter ii. 5-9. *Priest's-office* occurs *twice*—Luke i. 9, Heb. vii. 5—both referring to the Levitical priesthood. It thus appears that in the New Testament there is not even *one* allusion to the existence of a priest in the Church of Christ, other than those which refer to the Lord himself as our High Priest, or those which designate the entire Church a Spiritual Priesthood to offer Spiritual Sacrifices unto God by Him. Priesthood, then, as the Roman, Anglican, and other Priests impose it upon their followers, has no Scripture warrant, and is but a worthless sham. The first Christians knew nothing of it; and their Pagan neighbours proclaimed the fact that the disciples of Christ had neither material altar, nor sacrifice, and were wholly without a priesthood. Impartial history thus records—

"The Christians had neither sacrifices nor altar, nor images, nor oracles, nor sacerdotal robes; and this was sufficient to bring upon them the reproaches of an ignorant multitude, who imagined there could be no religion without these. Thus they were looked upon as a sort of Atheists; and by the Roman law, those who were chargeable with Atheism, were declared the pest of human society. But this was not all. The sordid interests of a multitude of lazy and selfish priests were immediately connected with the ruin and oppression of the Christian cause. The public worship of such an immense number of deities was a source of subsistence, and even of riches, to the whole rabble of priests and augurs, and also to a multitude of merchants and artists. And

their "*bodies*" "*living sacrifices*" and in contrast to the bodies of dead animals, offered by the Jewish priest.—2. Their *faith* is a sacrifice. Paul wrote, "And if I be poured out *upon the sacrifice and offering of your faith*, I am glad." Phil. ii. 17. That is to say, Paul was willing that his blood be poured out, like the wine poured on the meat-offerings to render them acceptable to God, if by that means he could render the faith of the Gentiles more firm, and, therefore, more pleasing to the Lord.—3. Contributions in support of needing preachers of the gospel. Phil. iv. 18.—4. Praise to God, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to His name. Heb. xiii. 15.—5. The doing of good generally, and particularly by communicating or attending to the fellowship. Heb. xiii. 16. It must be remembered that the whole of the offerings of God's Spiritual Priests are of the nature of thankofferings—none are for atonement. The one and sufficient offering of our Saviour, who is both priest and victim, has perfected for ever those who are sanctified, and also, for ever, made an end of offerings for sin,

the progress of the gospel threatened the ruin of this religious traffic, This raised up new enemies to the Christians, and armed the rage of a mercenary superstition against their lives and cause."—*Mosheim*.

Surely the alarm of the Pagan Priests would have been avoided had the early Christians met them in their own line with a ritualistic worship. Take a few lines from Haweis' Church History:—

"Nothing could be more unadorned than the primitive worship. A plain man chosen from among his fellows, in his common garb, stood up to speak or sat down to read the Scriptures to as many as chose to assemble in the house to hear. The idea of a priesthood had yet scarcely entered the Christian sanctuary, as there remained no more sacrifice for sin, and but one high-priest, Jesus Christ. But, on the dissolution of the whole Jewish economy under Adrian, when the power of the associated clergy began to put forth its bud, the ambitious suggested what many of the rest received in their simplicity, that the succession of these honours now devolved upon them, and that the bishop stood in the place of the high-priest; the presbyters were priests; and the deacons levites; and so a train of consequences followed. Thus a new tribe arose, completely separated from their brethren, of clergy distinct from laity—men sacred by office, exclusive of a divine call and real worth. The altar, indeed, was not erected, nor the unbloody sacrifice of the eucharist perfected; but it approached by hasty strides to add greater sanctity to the priesthood, and the most unpleasant adjunct of the divine right of tithes to the divine right of episcopacy."

It then follows, that wherever the church consists of priestly and unpriestly members, that apostacy prevails; that there you have a compound of Judaism and Heathenism; and that there the Church of Christ is not.

THE CLERGY.

The word *clergy* comes to us from *κλήρος*, *lot* or *inheritance*. The application of this term to the priesthood has Old Testament authority. "The Priests, the Levites, and all the tribe of Levi, shall have no lot nor *inheritance* with Israel; they shall eat the offerings of the Lord made by fire, and His inheritance. Therefore shall they have no inheritance among their brethren." Deu. xviii. Thus the tribe of Levi was called the *inheritance* (or clergy) of the Lord, while, reciprocally, He was called their inheritance. In every Church in which a *clergy* is recognized, there, as a consequent, is the *laity*. The word *λαός* is found in the New Testament over one hundred and thirty times, and is translated *people*. Were we now lifted out of the Dispensation of the Spirit and carried back to that of the Law, nothing would be more appropriate than the terms *clergy* and *laity*; the one designating the *priests*, and the other the *people* as distinguished from the priesthood. But no trace of such distinction is found in the present economy—it belongs not to the Church of Christ. Not that *λαός* is not used in the New Testament to denote the people in contradistinction to the Church of God, which is the *Royal Priesthood*, and the only one now acknowledged. It is used (as we use the word *people*) to designate the nation under the law, the unconverted masses, and the Church of Christ. But whenever it is applied to the Church it expresses the *whole body* and never stands for an unpriestly or unclerical portion thereof—as, "An holy nation, a peculiar *people*"—"A peculiar *people* zealous of good works." So, too, *κλήρος* (which occurs in the New Testament some thirteen times) is never used to distinguish a section, or class, of God's people from the many or other portion of the Lord's Church. In Ephesians i. ii., the whole Church is said to "*have obtained an inheritance*" in Christ, or, expressed literally, "to have been taken as His *inheritance*," *lot*, or *clergy*. So that the Lord's people are, as a whole, the Lord's *clergy*, and the only clergy He has. Bishops, elders, pastors, are not designated clergy, otherwise than as the poorest and most illiterate of

the flock are so designated; every one of whom is a clergyman, or a clergywoman, in the only sense in which the term can be applied to any. Peter wrote to the elders, saying, "Feed the flock of God, which is among you, taking the oversight, not by constraint, but willingly, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's *heritage*." Here, *heritage* is a translation of *κληρος*, and the whole Church is designated God's clergy, over which the elders are forbidden to constitute themselves lords. Every member of the people, or *laity*, of Acts xv. 14, Rom. ix. 26, 2 Cor. vi. 16, is one of the *clergy* of 1 Peter v. 3.

There is, then, no clerical caste or order in the Church of God—all the laity of God are the clergy of Christ; and by this standard we determine the Greek Church, the Roman Church, the Anglican Church, the Irvingite Church, the Mormon Church, &c., to appertain to the Apostacy and to have no claim to be received as that institution set up by the authority of Christ and designated the Church of God. D. K.

ORGANIC UNITY.

I.—THE government which God originally established in Israel was different from all other national governments in two important particulars. It had no *legislative* body. There was no man, nor body of men, who could make a law, repeal a law, or amend a law. This was not because they were without law, but because God himself had made for them a code of laws at the beginning of their national history. As their laws were of divine origin they were perfect for their purpose. The man who should attempt to repeal one of them would array himself against God; he who should amend would assume to know more than God, and he who should add would assume that God's code was insufficient. No one of these things could be done; therefore, no legislative body was needed.

The nation had no *executive* head. No king nor chief was appointed to see to the *execution* of the laws. This was the more singular from the fact that, instead of being a consolidated nation, Israel was composed of partially independent tribes, with laws of marriage and inheritance intended to perpetuate their individuality. The wisdom of the world would say that such a nation would of necessity fall into anarchy without an executive head. The wisdom of God provided for it no such head.

Still farther, from the time that the tribes ceased to be grand divisions of a moving army, under Moses and then under Joshua, there was not even an executive head over the individual tribe. Were they, then, without executive authority? Was it no man's business in all Israel to see that his neighbour obeyed the law, to judge between man and man, and to vindicate the right? There certainly was an executive power. The law provided that judges should be appointed in every city. Their jurisdiction extended to every spot of the adjacent territory which was nearer their own city than any other.

The Church which Christ established differed in two important particulars from the Churches which men have established. Unlike nearly all other Churches, after the departure of the apostles, it was without a legislative body. It contained no man, nor body of men, who could make a law, repeal a law, or amend a law. This was not because the Church was without law, but because Christ himself, through the Twelve, had made for it a perfect law—a law of liberty which freed it from the dominion of human law-makers for ever. Like the law given to Israel, it provided in advance, by infinite wisdom, for all possible

contingencies. No man could propose to repeal one of its provisions without rebellion against Christ, none could amend without claiming wisdom superior to Christ's, none could add without declaring Christ's law insufficient. No legislative body was needed—there was no work left for it to do.

More singular still, the Church was left without a visible head. No Pope, nor Ecumenical Council, nor General Conference, nor General Assembly, was provided, whose duty it should be to see to the general execution of the perfect law. The Church was not consolidated within a narrow territorial limit, but was distributed into general divisions by Provinces and languages, as distinctly as was the Roman Empire. Yet, not even over any individual Province, was there a Provincial or Diocesan Bishop, a Synod, or a Conference.

Was the Church, then, without an executive? Not more so than was Israel under the Theocracy. Like the judges in every city, there were overseers in every congregation. Their jurisdiction extended to all within their respective limits. To these overseers alone was committed the executive rule of the Church.

To both of these peculiarities of the Church's organization, the wisdom of man objects and has always objected. Yet the wisdom of God appointed it, and for three hundred years, until the first Council of Nice, the Church existed without a legislative head, and much longer than this without an executive head.

II.—In the course of time, Israel became weary of the government which God had given them, and undertook to amend it. They wanted an executive head of perpetual succession. Human wisdom says, how can a nation, composed of separate tribes, maintain an effective nationality, without some supreme head to judge of the conduct of all and to enforce the law upon all? And how can such a nation, without a head to command its military strength, resist the encroachments of its enemies? In the days of Samuel, Israel, reasoning thus, came together before Samuel at Ramah, and said: "We will have a king over us, that we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may *judge* us, and go out before us, and *fight our battles*." The Lord said to Samuel, "They have not rejected *thee*, but they have rejected *me*, that *I* should not reign over them." Here was a principle announced which Israel had not thought of, which had not entered the mind of Samuel, and which even Christians have most strangely overlooked. It is declared by God himself, and it must stand against all human judgment. In rejecting the form of government which God had appointed, Israel rejected God, that he should not reign over them. Whoever, then, in any age, in Church or State, rejects the government which God has appointed, rejects the sovereignty of God, and sets up to govern himself.

But before we condemn too severely the conduct of Israel, let us ask if they had not a good cause. Had the government not failed in those respects in which they sought to amend it? Had not city governments failed to discharge their duties? Had not tribes at times infringed upon the rights of other tribes? Had not surrounding nations rushed in upon them in their unorganized condition, and desolated their land and subjected them to tribute? Their history shows that all these things had occurred. Yet it also shows that though all these disorders had arisen, they had all been suppressed. Though they had no constant ruler to lead them out against their enemies, they had never been defeated nor overrun, except when they deserved it, and when it would have been wrong had it

been otherwise; and they had never deserved a man to lead them to victory, that one had not been found. Of all this Samuel reminded the people, saying, in one of his speeches, "When your fathers cried to the Lord and said, We have sinned, the Lord sent Jerubbaal, and Bedan, and Jephthah, and Samuel, and delivered you out of the hands of your enemies on every side, and you dwelt in safety." No failure in the old government, then, could have excused Israel in their demand for a change.

Shall we pause now, and pronounce upon this revolution, or shall we seek further to find a palliation for it?—Perhaps they were ignorant of the real consequences of a change, and imagined that it would bring nothing but good to the nation. So they might have been when first their demand was made, but not so before the consummation of the revolution. By the command of God himself, Samuel warned them in reference to all the evils of monarchy. The standing army to support the throne, the enforced labor, the landed aristocracy, and the enormous taxation which belong to all tyrannical forms of government, none of which had yet been experienced by Israel, were all foretold in burning words; but when the terrible catalogue had been recited, the only response to the grey-haired prophet was the impatient cry, "Nay, but we will have a king over us."

The die was now cast. The revolution was completed. The new king, during a brilliant, yet sad and mournful reign, consolidated the government, and wrought the tribes into a compact nationality. His successor perfected the internal organization and carried the conquests of Israel to the utmost boundary promised to Abraham. The loftiest expectations of Israel were realized, and men were ready to pronounce the revolution the happiest event in Jewish history, when the very splendour of this success, filling the royal family with arrogance and the heavily taxed people with discontent, brought about, at the death of Solomon, a disruption of the kingdom. Disaster upon disaster followed, until in the Babylonish captivity were seen the bitter fruits of rejecting God from reigning over Israel.

The parallel to all this in the history of the Church is striking. The time came that the Spiritual Israel grew weary of the simple government by individual congregations, which God had given them, and demanded a change. They wanted a system for the better preservation of order, for more successful warfare against the enemy. Had there been a failure? The answer is decisive: by the former administration they had conquered the world. The Jewish temple and ritual had been abandoned, and heathen altars had ceased to smoke. It was with the world at their feet that they wanted a king to fight their battles; with an internal administration, which, despite all its irregularities, had extorted the admiration of the world, that they demanded a king to judge them. Paul had warned them against the man of sin, and John had held forth the enormities of this apostacy in images painted on the very heavens, in colors which heaven alone could paint; but still they exclaimed, "Nay, but we *will* have a king over us." Thus a second time God's Israel rejected God from reigning over them, in rejecting the government which he had ordained. The Bishops, the Councils, and the Popes came on in rapid succession. The church was consolidated. It rose in splendour, like the throne of David and the magnificence of Solomon. Kings and Queens from the most distant parts of the earth came to behold its glory; but the very brightness of this triumph blinded the eyes of those who gazed, until deep darkness filled the whole earth, and another Babylonish captivity en-

shrouded the hopes of the world. No more desolate were the hills of Judah, when Nebuzaradan had broken down the walls of Jerusalem, and carried the remnant of the multitude away, than was the Church of the living God when the great whore which sitteth upon many waters had made the inhabitants of the earth drunk with the wine of her fornication. A remnant of the poor were left in Judah, fit type of the hunted and persecuted saints whose blood was drunk by the woman clothed in scarlet and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls.

III.—There are churches in the present age without a legislative body, and without an executive head. They have accepted the New Testament, the code of precepts and statutes given by the Spirit of God, as their all-sufficient rule of faith and practice, and they recognize no executive officers to enforce this law, except the overseers of individual congregations. No one man or body of men has executive authority over them all, nor do executive bodies preside over them by provinces, nations, or states.

The wisdom of man objects to this, and calls it anarchy. The consolidated bodies of the sectarian world have told us from the beginning that our bond of union is but a rope of sand; and that we can never attain to efficient action as a people without an organic unity, such as they themselves have devised. So long and loud and persistent has been this cry, that the echo of it sometimes strikes us from unexpected quarters, and we are brought almost to the brink of the question, shall we not also have a King to reign over us, that we may be like others? Are there not many great and good objects now out of our reach, which we could secure if some of us had the power of dictating to the churches, and combining and controlling their energies according to our own great wisdom. The mind which ponders this question with favour, and gives a loose reign to the imagination will doubtless be filled with many golden visions of hopes realized and mighty deeds accomplished, which would astonish the world and glorify God. Such dreams are seductive. They are likely to silence the voice of conscience and lead to new constructions of the word of God. When their seductive voice is hushed, and the ear is opened again to the word of God, we hear once more the answer of Jehovah to the prophet Samuel, "This people have not rejected you, but they have rejected me from reigning over them." We remember, that to revolutionize a form of government given us by the living God, is to reject our divine head for a human head. We have one King in Zion, who is "head over all things for the Church," and we fear, as we fear the terrors of perdition, to reject him from ruling over us. We shudder, then, at the thought of change, and we begin to look around and ask ourselves, what occasion there is even for the suggestion of this heaven-daring thought.

We ask ourselves, and we ask the carping world around us, has the form of government which God gave us proved a failure in our hands? They answer, Yes; for behold congregations in disorder; preachers who are unworthy; members who are scattered like sheep without a shepherd; want of co-operation; and the want of aggressive power. We look around, and, true enough we see all these. But then, as we look a little farther, we see the same things in the parties who have made them a King to reign over them. Is it Methodism that we begin to admire? Where will you look on the broad earth for more congregations in disorder; more preachers who are unworthy; more members who are scattered; more division and strife? Is it Episcopalianism which has the King you admire? What party can be found more distracted and perplexed by internal dissensions, more bitterly cursed with petty feuds, or making itself

so ludicrous in the eyes of the world? As well be envious of a company of little girls quarrelling over their doll's dresses, as of a church whose chief concern is about questions of priestly millinery and bows and genuflexions. Truly the Kings who have reigned over the Samaritan tribes of the modern days have no great things to boast of. Our modern Israel, with no King but Jesus, has risen to power and glory among them and against them almost in a day. A victory more glorious than ever greeted the armies of Gideon or Barak has been ours. Shall we now despise the weapons which have won us the victory? Shall we vilely cast away the shield which has protected us till the danger is all past? Shall we imitate Amaziah, who conquered Edom, and then bowed down to the gods of Edom which could not deliver their own people out of his hands? If we do, then another Babylonish captivity will be ours as sure as the same God reigns now who reigned over Israel, and who reigned in the Churches planted by the apostles.

We confess that all is not as it should be among us, but we know too well the devices of Satan to be caught by him in the old snare which has been fatal to so many. We will persevere in the old paths, and continue with unfaltering faith the remedies which God has supplied. No congregation has yet for any long time continued in anarchy or in disregard of the law of God, without, by some means, being brought to repentance or being blotted out of existence. No feuds among the tribes have yet dismembered the nation, nor can they while we remain without a King.—When Rehoboam comes to the throne, and not till then, will that disaster befall us. No wandering stars have shed their baleful light upon us, that have not gone out in darkness. No Goliath has yet defied the armies of the living God, that a David has not taken the field against him; nor has any danger yet come that a Gideon or a Barak or a Samson has not been found to meet the emergency. Our invisible head has thus far provided well for us, and our faith in him is unabated. With providential and ministerial agencies continuously at work, sustained as they ever must be by the corrective force inherent in the truth, we will correct disorders in the future as we have done in the past, but with an ever increasing ratio of success. Our congregations now possess organic unity in the only form devised by the wisdom of God. It is the unity, under one executive body, of those alone who meet in one place for worship. Independent of each other as respects executive authority, but mutually dependent as respects the universal law of love and fellowship, these congregations answer to the cities of Israel, and constitute the one people of the living God. No citizen of Christ's kingdom is exempt from their authority; no statute of the King reaches beyond their jurisdiction; no violation of law is above or beneath the reach of their executive arms. They are appointed by infinite wisdom, and in them is once again fulfilled the saying that, "Wisdom is justified by her children."—*Apostolic Times*.

"God has done, or is doing, all He can to save the lost. He is ready to meet every Prodigal who resolves to rise and go to Him, and does so. He promises to draw near to those who draw near to Him. He is not willing that any should perish! He commands only that which is for our good! He forbids only that which is detrimental to us! Our conformity to His will is for His glory, and for our honour and happiness! To all His commands promises are annexed!"

WORDS FROM THE WORK-TABLE.—No. XXIX.

SLAVERY.

"And be not *conformed* to this world, but be ye *transformed* by the renewing of your minds."—Rom. xii. 2.

"Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants (slaves) to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey."—Rom. vi. 16.

"As obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance: but as He which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy."—1 Peter i. 14, 15.

THE old fiend, Slavery, has of late had so considerable a shaking that the life is nearly gone out of him. It took hard work and much money to deliver from his grip our own Colonial slaves. But, thanks to good men and women and the direct and indirect influence of the Bible, it was done.

Then there was that dreadful American slavery! Oh! the tears, and pangs, and blood, that stand to its account. But in a way no one expected, and in almost no time, the monster was throttled and 4,000,000 slaves were set free. So that in yonder broad country, as in this favoured land, there exists no slave!!

More recently, the slaves of another slave-country have been placed on a footing of nominal freedom, which in a short time will secure actual and complete deliverance.

Then the serfs of the vast Russian empire are now made free, and thus the world goes on in the march of improvement.

But there are other slaves that governments and revolutions cannot set free, and their number is *Legion*. Their slavery is self-imposed, and if ever saved from it they *must* be self-delivered. I do not say that they could, in and of themselves, have delivered themselves had help not been given. But all that is needful to break their chains and set them free has been provided and, though most of them groan in their bondage, they hug their chains and suffer on, and will do until they die.

These self-constituted slaves are the SLAVES OF SIN, and never had poor African slave a harder tyrant for a master than have they.

SIN (their lord) is not at all a straightforward being. He has more names than any other deceiver that ever trod the earth and appears in shapes and dresses more various than those of the stage player of widest range.

A volume on this subject would fail to do it justice—a mere fragment can only glance at two or three of the masks under which this monster shows his face. He appears, then, as—1, My Lord Fashion; and, 2, as The God Appetite; and, as said before, in a variety of other characters. Some who would not enter his service in the one character readily do so in another.

Let us look at him as *Lord Fashion*! Here he rules with iron hand. Nothing is too strange and absurd for him to dictate, and the obedience of his slaves is perfect, even to the loss of comfort, home, fortune, health, friends, and even their own soul. Of course as lord of fashion he rules in a hundred ways at the same time. Everything chops and changes about at his caprice. I will only just illustrate this by reference to one line of things—*Dress*. Did we not *see* and *know*, it would be impossible to imagine the perfect slavery, in this respect, of thousands of people who are not wanting in education, nor in intellectual power; nor can we claim that many, who certainly have some good amount of love for Christ, are free from the infatuation of this tyrant. The following will tell of some of the freaks of Lord Fashion.

"In the eleventh century both sexes wore sleeves and skirts so long that they had to be fastened up in knots in order to avoid treading upon them, and cuffs hanging from these sleeves like pendant canoes. Early in the fourteenth century we find men with long-toed shoes fastened to their knees or girdles by chains of gold or silver; clothed in a garment reaching to their heels, close before but strutting out at the sides, so that at the back they looked like women; their hoods were little, tied under the chin; the sleeves were deep and wide, shaped like a bagpipe, and called pokeys—this garment was worn alike by master and servant. The sleeves were sometimes designated "The devil's receptacles," for whatever could be stolen was popped into them. Some were so long and wide that they reached to the feet, and at this period the street-sweepers' assistants were not all females. Occlive, in his poem of 'Pride and Waste Clothing,' says:—

'What is a Lord without his man?
I put case—his foes him assail
Suddenly in the street, what help shall he,
Whose *sleeves* encumbrous so side trail
Do to his Lord,—he cannot him avail;
In such a case he is *but* a woman;
He may not stand him in the stead of a man;
His two arms have right enough to do,
And somewhat more, his *sleeves* up to hold.

Now have these Lords *little need of Brooms*
To sweep away the filth out of the streets.
Since wide sleeves of penniless grooms
Will it up lick."

A poet of the 13th century compares the ladies of his day to peacocks and magpies; "for the pies," says he, "naturally bear feathers of various colours; so the ladies delight in strange habits and diversity of ornaments. The pies have long tails that trail in the dirt; so the ladies make their tails a thousand times longer than those of peacocks and pies."

Were it not for the quaint style we might suppose this was lately written.

In the 15th century the women attained a towering height by placing on their heads a steeple-shaped cap, half a yard and upwards high, with two wings like ape's ears. Addison says, "The women might probably have carried this Gothic building much higher, had not a famous monk, Thomas Coneete by name, attacked it. He travelled from place to place to preach it down, and succeeded so well, that as the magicians sacrificed their books to the flames upon the preaching of an apostle, many of the women, in the middle of his sermon, threw down their head-dresses and made bonfires of them. He often had a congregation of 20,000 people, the men ranged on one side of the pulpit, the women on the other, appearing like a forest of cedars, with their heads reaching to the clouds. He so warmed and animated the people against this ornament, that whenever it appeared in public it was pelted down by the rabble, but notwithstanding, when the preacher departed, it appeared again; the women, like snails in a fright, had drawn in their horns, and shot them out again when the danger was over."

In the 16th century petticoats which had hitherto entirely covered the feet, were curtailed in length to extend in breadth, and that monstrosity, the *Fardingale*, was generally worn, concerning which we have an amusing anecdote—"When Sir Peter Vych went as ambassador to the Grand

Seignior from James the First, his lady accompanied him to Constantinople and the Sultanness having heard much of her, desired to see her; whereupon Lady Wych attended by her waiting women, all of them dressed in their Fardingales (which was the court dress of the time) waited upon her Highness. The Sultanness received her visitor with great respect, but struck by the extraordinary extension of the hips of the whole party, seriously enquired if that shape was peculiar to the natural formation of English women; and Lady Wych was obliged to explain the whole mystery of the dress in order to convince her that they were not really so deformed as they appeared to be."

The 17th century shows us all the gentlemen of England in a peruke or periwig, in *compliment* to Charles the First, who happened to have long curling hair; the ladies appearing in very low-necked dresses, and with bare arms, which again roused the ire of the divines.

In the 18th century the wig gives place to powder and pomatum, for both classes, and the macaw-like toupé and portentous tail for the gentlemen. In George Huddersford's "Wiccamical Chaplet" we find these quaint lines upon a female head dress, showing that over a hundred years ago things were pretty much as they are to-day.

"Have ye never seen a net
Hanging at your kitchen door,
Stuffed with dirty straw, beset
Full of skewers o'er and o'er?
If ye have—it wonder breeds
Ye from thence should steal a fashion;
And should heap your lovely heads
Such a heap of dirty trash on.
True, your tresses wreathed with art,
(Bards have said it ten times over,
Form a net to catch the heart
Of the most unfeeling lover:

But, thus robbed of half your beauty,
Whom can you induce to buy?

When he views your tresses thin
Tortured by some French Friseur;
Horse-hair, hemp, and wool within
Garnished with a diamond skewer;
When he scents the mingled steam
That your plastered heads are rich in,
Lard, and meal, and clouted cream,
Can he love a walking kitchen?"

After such a string of absurdities I feel assured that you will agree with me that it is high time to abjure the mummeries of fashion.

Now don't ask whether I want all coats one shape, or all dresses the same colour. I want nothing of the sort. But we should all want to be FREE—to wear what is convenient, suitable, and proper, and never to submit to what we do not like, and to what is inconvenient and unseemly, because Lord Fashion commands. If we do thus submit to him, then we are slaves—self-made slaves.

Then as to *appetite*. How many are poor all their lives because they swallow house and lands, business and property. All is turned into drink? Hearts torn, children neglected and destroyed, the hearts of wives broken, and husbands driven mad. And this slavery to appetite does not prevail merely with the drunkard, but with every such one before he became a drunkard, and with thousands now on the road. And the drinking shrine is not the only one at which the god *appetite* is worshipped.

Then, too, millions are slaves to *Ambition*. How much did that estate cost? How much? Why the soul and body of its owner! See that miserable man and woman! They are legally husband and wife. They married without love. She wanted a *title*, and he was a lord. He wanted money, and she had hundreds of thousands; and their life is a misery! Now all these are slaves—worse is their slavery than was that of America. Because here the iron kills the soul. The Christian is one who has been a slave to sin; but who in obeying from the heart the divine doctrine has

become dead to that old tyrant master and alive to another, whose service gives present bliss and everlasting glory.

"Hear ye the truth and hearing it obey,
Know ye the truth, the truth shall make you free,
Love not the midnight, love the lightsome day,
'Tis life and liberty.

"The Free One makes you free; he breaks the rod,
He bids you lift your heads to sky and sun,
As freemen of the everlasting God,
Kneeling to him alone.

"The Free One makes you free; be slaves to none,
Priest, Prince, or Self, in body or in soul:
Serve thou with all thy strength thy God alone,
Yield but to his control.

"The True One gives you truth; a heritage,
Richer than that which kings may buy or sell."

"Choose ye then this day whom ye will serve!!"

Birmingham.

LOUISE.

THE CHANNEL OF DIVINE BLESSINGS.—How, on what principle, with what propriety, can God—the Holy, Just, and True—bless so profusely and strangely such creatures as we are? . . . Our very need makes the difficulty. . . . The needing of *such* things implies that they could without any unfairness, unkindness, injustice, be withheld. That is to say, a judge can pardon only where he might rightly punish, and where he has a real right to punish he may, with a real propriety, refuse to pardon. How, then, do we come to receive this blessing of pardon, with its attendant peace, and not these alone, but every spiritual blessing? Two short words will tell the whole, and the words are—in *Christ*. . . . Here we have the solution of the appalling difficulty, the justification of the mysterious liberality, and the channel from the Father's heart to the Church's bosom of all the good that ever has come to us, or ever shall, while our treasure lasts in the heavenly places. The *treasure* is in Christ. Are *we* in Christ? Then all is settled—the treasure is ours.—*Ancient Landmarks*,

"THE WAY, THE TRUTH, AND THE LIFE."

There is a way—it leadeth unto God,
Divinely planned, that those who seek may find;
By willing feet this pathway must be trod,
And Jesus says to each enquiring mind,
"I am the Way."

There is a gift, by sovereign grace bestowed,—
The Light of Life, to scatter gloom afar;
Awhile on earth its holy lustre glowed,
And now from heaven it shines—our Morning Star—
Jesus "the Truth."

He lives who once was dead, and from the grave,
The spoils of conquest strew the Victor's way.
He lives, and bids the fainting heart be brave;
Bids him look up, and hear the Saviour say
"I am the Life."

The Way, the Truth, the Life! no more I need;
That way I'll tread, or good, or ill betide;
That truth maintain, His precious precepts heed,
Hope for that life, and still in Him confide,
Who lives for aye.

J. C.

Open Council.

THE TABERNACLE OF DAVID.—EXPLANATIONS.

DEAR MR. EDITOR.—Clerical errors have an amusing phase, if we could quietly forget the deep mortification. Between twenty and thirty years ago I had occasion to name Ammonias Saccas in a Review of D'Aubigne the historian. The poor man stands in the *Messenger*, plain for all folks to see, as "Ammonias Jackass." Though foolish in his corrupt allegorising tendencies, he was really a man of considerable worldly wisdom, and I never intended to paint him as an animal with long ears, addicted to the consumption of thistles, or given to bray out music in any tonic sol-fa fashion. The printing of my last article reminds me of the circumstance. Let me in this note correct a few of the worst of the errors, or the puzzle to the reader will be as great as the annoyance to the writer. On page 17, "Times of *Retribution*" (Restitution); page 18, "*aright* solemn and realizing" (bright); page 20, "God-given *Lord* (land); "the *convex* of this (converse).

MORAL for Editors:—Please send proof.*

I have heard the chirrup from Wigan. Colliery smoke may lead into obscurity as well as fen fog. As to the geography—I went over the ground before our friend was born, and I have not forgotten it. It frequently happened in the worst of fen times, that the towns or villages slightly elevated, suffered even more than the places where the steam was born. But this is a slight matter. The remaining matter is more serious, "where the sinful kingdom of Amos is interpreted to mean the Man of Sin." Such is the statement of our lucid friend—but it is a gross and shameful blunder which nothing can justify. I have given no such interpretation. Amos speaks of the sinful kingdom. While I had that before me, I took occasion to glance rapidly at the Person whom I believe will stand at the head of that kingdom, and I only did that to correct the deplorable theory which confounds the Man of Sin with the Papacy. But the Prophet Amos is not responsible in any way for my digression concerning the Man of Sin, as he only names the kingdom, but utters no word concerning the king. Another person represents me as affirming that the people of Israel will become at some future period the Sinful Kingdom. I would not have glanced at this blunder save for its connexion with the matter before me. I find myself talking to men who have not even mastered the elementary principles—much less the grammar or logic of prophecy and its relations.

As to the Sinful kingdom, a few words simply of explanation, that the reader may know at least from what platform I speak. During the last fifty years the most eminent students of Prophecy have generally returned

* The *moral* is not the right one. In printing a periodical, any number of which may contain contributions from twenty writers, sending proof to each is not practicable. Only occasionally, and in some very special case, could the printer forward proof to contributors. The moral is not, "*Please send proof*," but "*Please write distinctly*." Not that the writer of the above can be charged with sending bad copy, for page after page of his sending bears neither slur nor erasure. Upon the whole we very rarely receive better manuscript than his. Still he falls down occasionally to small writing, and then letters become so far indistinct that here and there what a word is can only be known from the context—the samples given above are of this kind. It is easy to mistake "Lord" for *land*, "bright" for *aright*, and "retribution" for *restitution*. Our scribes will oblige us much by minding the moral—"Please write distinctly." ED.

to the faith of apostolic and patristic times. I could give a list of the men and their works—powerful in intellect, and ripe in scholarship—Transatlantic, English, and Continental. But such list would fill up too much space, and serve no purpose. The burden of their Exposition is as follows:—In the last days the Fourth Empire will be raised—if not into resurrection life—at least into galvanic energy. The ancient Latin territory shall be divided into *ten* kingdoms, ruled over by ten democratic kings, who after destroying the Papal Harlot, make over their immense power into still stronger hands, becoming vassals of a Supreme Autocrat Warrior-King—Wild Beast—Man of Sin—Son of Perdition—with an eloquent, blaspheming mouth, with supernatural working of the infernal order, and with claims to exclusive Godhead. This warrior-king, who reigns over not only subject, but *worshipping* nations, shall make Jerusalem his capital, and sit in the Temple of God as a god. The former interpreters used to go poking into the western division of Rome to seek for the *ten* kings, forgetting that the image of Daniel had *two* legs. Revived Rome must have the east as well as the west—five kings in each division, corresponding with the toes on each foot. It will be seen that as the image of our former interpreters had only *one* leg—by consequence their theory had *no* legs at all. The Sinful kingdom endures until the stone falls upon it with shattering, effectual force—and its king reigns until he is blasted and paralysed by the *parousia* of the Lord. As the result of thirty years continuous study of prophetic and apostolic documents, I have no hesitation in saying that these matters are as clearly taught as Redemption by the blood of Jesus, or Sanctification by the Holy Spirit. But in this very bald statement it is not my purpose either to expound or vindicate. All that I have in view is to state simply, that though God will make an *utter end* of the Sinful Kingdom, yet He will not utterly destroy *one* of the races which are gathered under the wings of the incarnate evil spirit—the Destroyer. That race is spared for the highest destiny among all earthly powers. It is not necessary for me to tell any one where I believe the supreme heavenly glory will be. The kingdom of God, so far as administration is concerned, was taken from them and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. They might have had the first place, but can only have the second.

The note of the Editor is partly in the right direction. I have had an opportunity, unexpectedly, of comparing the passage quoted by James with the Septuagint version. James does not strictly and literally follow the Septuagint, but mingles the prophet and the translator. Of course his authority was perfect. Passages in the Septuagint, if they differ from the Original Hebrew, are of no conceivable authority unless quoted by our Sovereign Lord and His inspired legates. Whenever this happens the seal of God is affixed to the special rendering.*

* "The note of Editor is partly in the right direction." Another correspondent writes concerning the note—"I think there is an inaccuracy in the intimation that the words *after this*, though not found in the Hebrew text of Amos, are quoted by James from the *Septuagint*; for, although James mainly follows the *Septuagint* version, yet in the first part of the quotation he deviates both from that and the Hebrew text." This correspondent further intimates that the *Septuagint* is equivalent to "In that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David," while James is properly rendered, "After this I will return and will build again the tabernacle of David." How far, then, is the note of the Editor in the right direction? It was written in view of such testimony as that of Dr. A. Clark, who says, "Verses 16, 17 (of Acts xv.) are quoted nearly as they now stand in the *best editions* of the *Septuagint*, and are evidently taken from that version, which differs considerably from the Hebrew text." The Editor's purpose, then, in the

As to the matter which has been under consideration, in the interpretation of Acts xv., we have not merely to consider what Amos was referring to—though that is a prime element—but likewise the position of James in council, and the situation of his citation in connexion with the work described by Simeon. As to the nature of the *agreement*, all the essential harmonies might be pointed out, but the field is locked up for the present.

Many of the matters which divide Christian men will be simplified—very shortly—by time and providence, the ministers of the Lord. In the meantime we must simply—on all sides—utter our convictions to those who are able to receive them.

G. GREENWELL.

THE FALLEN TABERNACLE OF DAVID RESTORED.

IN attending to the second article by G. Greenwell, it is desirable to sum up the leading items of my first paper—1. That the words “After this,” quoted by James from Amos ix., refer not to a time subsequent to the calling of the Gentiles and yet future, but to the distress and destruction of the Sinful Kingdom of Israel, described by the Prophet in the preceding portion of his prophecy.—2. That the fallen tabernacle of David denotes the house or family of David.—3. That the fall of that house consisted in his crown and throne being cast to the ground, which was consummated when his son Eliakim was dethroned.—4. That David’s fallen tabernacle was rebuilt when Jesus, his Son, was Christed and made Lord over all.—5. That this exaltation of David’s Son and Lord to all power in heaven and in earth, was proclaimed first to the Jews, and afterwards to the residue of men to effect an ingathering out of all nations under Him who is Lord of all. These statements, in the *B. H.* for October, were amply sustained by divine testimony; and it is for the reader to judge whether he has proved any or all of them, to “belong to the region of fog.” Want of space prevents me from following G. G. through all the wanderings of his last paper, but I shall pursue him so far as may appear necessary. He begins by devoting more than a page to what he supposed Du Veil, D.D., had “muttered” upon the Saviour’s commission. Here we have proof that he has read my essay through a thick veil. There is not a word from Du Veil on the commission, all on that

first place, was to call attention to the fact, that the rendering of Amos given by James was substantially given three hundred years before, by the Seventy. This is really so. The further purpose was that of showing, that whether we read, “*In that day*” or “*After this*,” makes not the slightest difference, as the signification, in view of the context, is precisely the same. The words, use which form you please, are part of the quotation, and have simply no application till you ascertain the things previously stated by Amos and thus determine his application of them. This, of course, is a very easy business. Amos was a prophet of Judah, but he prophesied to the kingdom of Israel during the reign of Jeroboam. The “sinful kingdom” referred to, is the then existing kingdom of Israel, with its cup of iniquity nearly full. Amos therefore foretold the going away of the people into captivity, beyond Damascus; and Jehovah added—“Behold the eyes of the Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth; saving that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob.” Then it is immediately added, “In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen,” &c. “*In that day*,” then, clearly refers to the time when the then existing sinful kingdom of Israel should have been destroyed from among the kingdoms, and as a distinct kingdom cut off from the face of the earth. Read, if you prefer to do so, “*After this*,” and the reference is to the destruction of Israel as a separate kingdom. Whether soon after, or in the time of the apostles, or yet in the future, the phrase does not intimate; and on that point the Editor’s note gave no opinion, but left G. G. and E. E. to determine.

Ed.

subject is from my own pen. It is due to that good brother to say that I only know him as an eminent scholar and worthy Christian, and as in no way deserving to be designated a "degenerate Hebrew."* Now admitting all that can possibly be said on the limitation, in certain texts, of the words "all the world," "every creature," &c., can any student of Scripture, of sound mind, conclude that the command to preach the gospel was restricted to the limits of the old Roman Empire? That blessed commission is as broad as the world, and restricted to no people, kingdom, or empire. God "hath made of *one* blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," and in whatever clime the Christian finds his fellow man, he may with the loving Saviour's approval tell him the good news, that his Lord has tasted death for every man.

G. G. next, in nearly three pages, attempts to refute my statement that—"If it be true that Jesus is to reign over the Jews outwardly (the literal house of Jacob), His kingdom will be of this world; whereas He says, 'My kingdom is not of this world.' Hence His words to every man are, 'Verily, verily I say unto thee, except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.'" G. G.'s reasoning on this statement wears the aspect of opposition, but in reality there is nothing opposed, excepting a few imaginings, beyond the bounds of divine revelation. His conclusions in reference to the terms flesh, regeneration, and the glorious kingdom of God, are—1. "To be in the flesh is to be in a state of alienation from God.—2. "It is expected that the old man of nature will be drowned in the laver of regeneration." "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature; old things are passed away, behold all things are become new." Only by Christ and in Christ can they (the Hebrew nation) recover their territory and ancient glory."—3. "But, in another sense, even the regenerate are in the flesh, and cannot inherit the kingdom without a second regeneration. 'Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.' Hence inheritance in the glorious kingdom is only accomplished by resurrection, and by transformation of the living corresponding to such change of the dead; one great work in essential unity. But even then there will still be men in the flesh in both senses, though not inheriting the kingdom." Now in the above G. G. states definitely, that the Hebrew nation (by which he means the house of Jacob) will only *by and in Christ* recover their territory and ancient glory, and he plainly defines "in Christ" as implying *regeneration as taught in the New Testament*, which the Church of Christ, alone enjoys. Now then, when the house of Jacob shall be thus IN CHRIST, and, therefore, precisely on the *same level* with the Church of Christ as now recognised, will not that house, to all intents and purposes, be what the Church now is? G. G. has thus actually come to the same conclusion as myself—that the house of Jacob, after all, is the Church of Christ. Only he has got to it by a longer path. But he strangely adds that, "only *by Christ and in Christ can they recover their territory and ancient glory.*" But no such statement is expressed or implied in Old or New Testament! It is quite true, that the Hebrews, when under the law and in bondage, could only recover their territory and former glory by reformation—by "a new heart, and a new spirit." There is abundant proof that this change of heart and life was the condition on which the Lord would bring all Israel back to Zion; hence the exhortation, "Repent, and turn yourselves from all your transgressions, so iniquity shall not be your ruin. Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye

* Perhaps his degeneracy consisted in his becoming a Christian, and not a Millinarian.

die, O house of Israel."—Ez. xviii. But the Jew under the law, who underwent this change of heart and spirit, was not "born again," not "born of water and spirit;" was not "buried with Christ in baptism," "wherein we are risen with him;" was not "created in Christ Jesus;" and, therefore, he was not in Christ." Should the house of Jacob in the future be found in Christ, what "ancient glory" will they recover? The glory in Christ far exceeds *their ancient glory*, which was but typical and is now for ever passed away. If all the Jews in the world were this day in Christ, what interest would they feel in their old territory and glory, beyond that experienced by those of the nations who are in Christ, excepting it be that common liking which most men have for the homes of their fathers. And even in this respect Abraham and Jerusalem are as much to every man converted to Christ as they are to any unconverted Jew upon the face of the earth. G. G. says of a time still future, "*Then there will be men in the flesh in two senses.*" This, no doubt, is true—in these particulars it will be then as now. But he intimates that there will be at the *same time* a glorious kingdom, comprised in part of men risen from the dead. But he gives no proof, no canonical record. As this is his private property he may enjoy it to his heart's content. When the dead in Christ are raised and the living changed, they will certainly find in a better earth than this that which Peter refers to, "Nevertheless, we, according to His promise, look for a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness" And wherein also shall be found the new Jerusalem, the tabernacle of God, and the throne of God and of the lamb; and where there will be no more curse, for the former things shall have passed away for ever. In this eternal state will be found the restitution of all things spoken by the prophets since the world began.

Our friend again says, "People with anointed eyes and strong hold of definite principles of interpretation, will no more dream of seeking the throne of David in the heavens, or the house of Jacob among the Gentiles, than they would think of seeking Mount Lebanon among the Derbyshire hills, or the River Jordan in the Vale of Clyde." It is certain that the rivers and mountains of Palestine are not in this country; but it is not so certain that Jerusalem, its throne, temple, and priesthood were not "patterns of things in the heavens." There is now a *New Jerusalem*, a *True Tabernacle*, a *Great High Priest*, and there also is the *Key of David*. These are matters of revelation and are, therefore, beyond controversy. Then with respect to the house of Jacob, if those in Christ are the seed of Abraham (which G. G. has not disproved, but confirmed), then that house is now among the Gentiles. We have infallible authority for saying, that the Church of Christ, as found among the nations, is the seed of Abraham. "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed."

"The reader who desires to study the subject (says G. G.) may read the judgment of the nations in the Valley of Jehoshaphat before the throne of David is revealed, or the tabernacle of David raised out of ruins." This he regards as still future, which is another deplorable misunderstanding of the prophets. Where, and what, is the Valley of Jehoshaphat? Where it is can only be answered by conjecture—*what* it signifies is clear. Numerous and powerful enemies gathered against Jehoshaphat and Judah, before whom they were powerless. In this helpless condition they came before the Lord, fasted, and cried to Him in their distress. He heard their cry and took the battle into His own hands and pleaded with the sword against their enemies and destroyed them. Then Jehoshaphat and Judah rejoiced in the Lord, and dwelt in the land with confidence.

2 Chron. xx. In like manner all Israel were powerless before those ancient kingdoms who took them captive, to which nations alone Joel alludes. But they cried unto the Lord in their distresses; and, as in Jehoshaphat's case, the Lord had a controversy with all those old nations, so He *pleaded* by sword and by fire with every nation under heaven. This war controversy with the nations He commenced after He had performed His work of chastisement and banishment on Mount Zion. He began with Assyria and the kingdoms under that empire. Then came Babylon and all the kingdoms under her monarchy. What followed this controversy with every ancient nation under heaven? 1. All Israel were set free from their bondage, and were at liberty to recover their ancient territory and glory, and so return to their land and cities, and to Mount Zion. 2. The house of Jacob now seeing that God had for their sakes pleaded by sword (according to the word of the prophets) with all the then powerful kingdoms of the earth, they no more courted their favour, but they rested on the Lord, and so dwelt in the land with confidence. Now I submit, as indisputable confirmation of the above affirmations, the following passages:—Joel iii. 1, 2, 9—14; Isa. lxvi. 15—24; Jer. xxv. 9—33. Compare fully all the prophets on these ancient nations—Isa. x. 12; Ezra i. 1—4; Jer. l.; Ez. xxviii. 25, 26; Isa. x. 20; Ez. xxix. 16. But G. G. affirms that, "There is in Ezekiel an account of a magnificent temple which has not yet been on the face of the earth." If what that vision represents has not yet been realized, it is absolutely certain that it never will be. Our friend looks at this temple through the same mystic veil that obstructs his vision in regard to other subjects in the prophets. I will try to lift it, that he may see clearly. 1. When Ezekiel saw this vision that beautiful temple built by Solomon was in ruins; so the city of the great King was also in heaps, the result of Israel's incorrigible iniquity! Now, the design of the vision of the temple was to make Israel ashamed of their condition and to assure them that if they would turn from their abominations the Lord would again dwell in their midst for ever—lxiii. 8—11. 2. "And he said unto me, Son of man, the place of my throne, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever." There had been before "the place of his throne," and "the place of his feet," in the temple which was destroyed by the King of Babylon, some fourteen years before. But we are told that He went *far* from His sanctuary, which was the *place* of His throne: and He *remembered not His footstool*. Indeed, Moses, Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders saw the feet of the God of Israel, and the place of His feet. Ex. xxiv. 10. The above passage in Ezekiel, then, what is it but a sublime assurance that the Lord would return after the captivity to the rebuilt temple—to the *place* of His throne and the *place* of His footstool. 3. The *Prince* seen in this vision, and so frequently mentioned, who is he? Unquestionably the High Priest. It is certain that the prince is not one of the "children of the resurrection," for they "neither marry nor are given in marriage." But this prince was a married man, had sons, and gave them property. Ez. xli. 16—18. It may be inquired on *what grounds* the high priest was thus called the *prince*? After the crown and throne of David was cast to the ground when Eliakim was dethroned, and after the Babylonian Captivity, *kingly* power was delegated to Joshua, the first high priest after that banishment, for so it is written, "Take them of the captivity, even of Hildai, of Tobijah, and of Jedaiah, which are come from Babylon, and come thou the same day, and go into the house of Josiah the son of Zephaniah; then take silver

and gold, and make crowns, and set them upon the head of Joshua the son of Josedech the high priest, and speak unto him, saying, Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, Behold the man whose name is The BRANCH; and he shall grow out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord, even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest on his throne." Zech. vi. 10—13. Thus then was kingly power invested in the high priest, who was therefore designated *prince*. Indeed the word prince is a common name for kings in Ezekiel. The king on David's throne in Jerusalem before the captivity was called a *prince*. xii. 10. The King of Tyrus was called a *prince*. xxviii. 2. See also xxvii. 21.

The Prince in Ezekiel's vision had to attend to the office of high priest, as performed in the temple before the Captivity. He had to prepare a bullock for a *sin offering for himself*, and for the people. "Upon that day shall the prince prepare for himself, and for all the people of the land, a BULLOCK FOR A SIN OFFERING."—xlv., 22. Again, "It shall be the prince's part to give burnt offerings, and meat offerings, and drink offerings in the feasts, and in the new moons, and in the Sabbaths, in all solemnities of the house of Israel; he shall prepare the *sin offering*, and the meat offering, and the burnt offering, and the peace offerings, TO MAKE RECONCILIATION for the house of Israel."—xlv., 17. Now the foregoing, found in Ezekiel's vision of the temple, is the clearest reference imaginable to the law of Moses, so clear that no child of ordinary intelligence can fail to see it. Yet Mr. Greenwell has the daring to say, "There is in Ezekiel an account of a magnificent temple which has not yet been on the face of the earth."!! If such teaching does not darken the glorious gospel of the grace of God, by words without knowledge, then I am at a loss to know what would so do! Such teachers should indeed be rebuked sharply, that they may be sound in the following precious articles of the faith:—"But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people. The Holy Ghost thus signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing, which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation. But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood, He entered in once, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"—Heb. ix. "This man, after He had offered ONE SACRIFICE FOR SINS FOR EVER, sat down at the right hand of God; henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by ONE OFFERING he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."—x., 12—14. "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having an high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil

conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; for He is faithful that promised."

Derby.

E. EVANS.

THE CENSUS.—HOW SHALL THE CHURCH BE DESIGNATED?

At the last Annual Meeting the following resolution was passed:—"That the Annual Meeting recommend the brethren and Churches to use one scriptural name, so that the number belonging to the "One Body" may be correctly shewn, and not in part amalgamated with any other body as heretofore. That Brs. Coop, Moffit, Tickle, and King be a Committee, for the purpose of recommending to the meeting the most desirable designation."

It has been said by some: What signifies how we are designated, provided we know that our position is the true one; and why need we care what the world and sects call us, when we are assured by the word of God that the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch?

To every question that may be asked there are two aspects, but this, a recommendation from the Birmingham Church, would not have been entertained, unless there had arisen a necessity for a clear and well defined designation; so that those who are guided solely by the word of truth, who have no creed or confession of faith by which they are associated, should be known. It was admitted that this would give an impetus to the spread of the truth, and prevent confusion, which arises from the want of such one and only name. How often is a brother asked, what are you? He answers, a Christian, a Disciple of Christ. And he is answered, so are all the various bodies who profess the name of Christ, and he can go no further without entering into a long disquisition as to the difference between a believer baptized into Christ and one who belongs to the general body, rantized or believed to be baptized by the Spirit, or in some unaccountable unscriptural way recognized as a Christian.

If the census shortly to be taken is made out on the same principle as that of the last, one of the columns to be filled up will indicate the sect or party to which the individual belongs. Referring to the list under this head, published ten years since, we find ninety-eight religious bodies making returns, but the one that we belong to is completely lost. We find "Baptized believers," "Believers in Christ," "Christians, who object to be otherwise designated," "Christian brethren," and other names that may or may not be returns of the members who belong to the "One Body."

In a Birmingham Directory we find the Church meeting in Charles Henry Street, under the head of Chapel, designated as Wesleyan, with the Rev. Henry King as minister. In one of later date, Summer Lane and Charles Henry Street are designated "Christian;" to the former Henry King is returned as minister; to the latter various—under the head of ministers. Referring again to the returns published under the last Census, we find all the leading sects mentioned, with the number of Churches and Chapels, and the members belonging to each—and then the minor religious sects so designated down to the Swedenborgians and Mormons, with the number of their Chapels summarised; but our not unimportant organization is passed over entirely. If then, when the next Census is taken, every brother make a return under the same designation, however scattered over the length and breadth of the land, with the Chapels or meeting places clearly stated, we shall have the satisfaction of knowing our numbers and places of meeting, and we shall not be jumbled up without name, place, or habitation.

What can be determined by the public when they hear of Charles Henry Street Chapel, Summer Lane Chapel, Hope Hall, Milton Hall, Barker Gate Chapel, as to the views promulgated and the distinctive doctrines there inculcated. If the word Methodist Independent, or Baptist were appended it would at once be known that the views entertained by said parties were there preached.

Enough has been stated to show that the name, if associated with the fact that the Bible is the only rule and guide of the persons holding it, would materially tend to bring out this important information. It is introduced in order to draw attention to what is conceived by some to be an important subject.

The names of the brethren appointed on the committee is sufficient guarantee that, at the next annual meeting, to be held in Newcastle, the question will be in a measure set at rest. In the meanwhile others may have their minds directed to the same question, and thus a satisfactory conclusion be arrived at.

E. FRASER.

REMARKS.

The above does not at all exaggerate the importance of the subject. The difficulty to be overcome is not a large one. We have merely in all

official returns and public documents to designate the Church by ONE of the designations found in the New Testament. We are not a people looking for a name and asking, who will tell us who we are? We know the designations of the Church, given by the Holy Spirit through the Apostles, and we claim and retain them. The Church organized by the authority of Christ is designated, the *Church of God*, the *Church of Christ*. In answer then to any official or other enquirer, who asks, what Church we belong to, let it be said—"The Church of God, meeting in such and such Chapel, &c. The members of the Church of God are, in Holy Scripture, designated Brethren, Disciples, Christians, Saints. We retain all these names, and apply one or the other as circumstance or taste may indicate; that is, in our ordinary converse. But to secure a registration of ourselves as one body, it is needful, that in all public documents (such as Census Schedules, Directories, Almanacks, &c.) one and the same designation be given. This, of course, can only be done by an agreement among ourselves. What, then, shall we write in the next Census-return, and subsequently in all public documents, in reply to the question—What are you, religiously? The choice seems to rest between "*Disciple*" and "*Christian*." But *Disciple*, in itself, is not descriptive enough, while *Christian* meets every requirement. It has apostolic authority; and it was given after the complete union of Jew and Gentile as the "*One New Man*." Let each member of the Church, then, report himself a *Christian*, and designate the Church in which he is enrolled "*The Church of God*," without other description, save that of the place in which it assembles. We shall thus honour both the Father and Son—the Church, as an institution, bearing the name of the Father, the members thereof named after the Son. Some among us have adopted the phrase "*Christian Brethren*." But, by all means, let us hear it no more. As a designation for the Church it is unscriptural, tautological, and indefinite. It is never once found in the Bible. If we are Christians we must be brethren. It is in use among certain Plymouth-brethren, and may cause our numbers to be counted to them, or theirs to us. Will the committee, alluded to in the foregoing, give these considerations their best attention? Our proposal is thus before them in good time.

Ed.

Reviews, Notes, Passing Events, &c.

HYMNS AND BIBLE-LESSON SONGS FOR CHILDREN: Published by D. KING, Birmingham.

THIS little book was published a few months ago under the impression that a very long time would elapse before a second edition would be called for, or the outlay repaid. It has, however, turned out otherwise—the first issue is exhausted and another edition is ready.

Its preparation and publication were undertaken very unwillingly, and not until everything we could put our hands upon, in the Shape of a Sunday School Hymn Book, had

been examined, and rejected as containing very much that children generally should not be encouraged to use. Thus expressing it falls far short of doing justice to the case, for books, most largely in use, seem compiled without regard to what children ought to sing—they contain language only fit for experienced Christians, invitations to sinners, much questionable doctrine, and in some cases but very little, indeed, truly fit for the young. In these

examinations not a few curiosities came under notice, such as—

"Do not quarrel, do not chide;
You must love each other;
Every comrade at your side
Is your Christian brother:
You have all been born anew,
Love and peace are fit for you,"

We should like to see the school in which the singing of these words would be other than a gross and ridiculous falsehood. Hymns of deep conviction of sin and longing surrender to Christ abound in Children's Hymn Books, which sung in any school would amount to little better than mockery; as—

"My faith looks up to thee,
Thou Lamb of Calvary:
Saviour divine!
Now hear me while I pray,
Take all my guilt away,
O let me from this day
Be wholly thine."

The foregoing verse is from the *Child's Own Hymn Book*, where, too, we have—

"Begone unbelief! My Saviour is near,
And for my relief will surely appear."

And also—

"Oh for a closer walk with God."
With the verse—

"Where is the blessedness I knew
When first I saw the Lord?
Where is the soul-refreshing view,
Of Jesus and His Word?"

Words put by Cowper into the lips of backsliders are here presented for school children. The fact is, they are not fit for any one to sing. Persons whose experience is thus expressed are not in a state to sing at all. Let them first regain their lost standing, and *then* sing of the joys of salvation.

Our little book of Hymns and Bible-Lesson Songs contains over 100 pieces of ordinary length. It will be considered a very small book or one of considerable size, according to the way in which it is measured. Looking merely at its number of pages you deem it small—considering that its entire contents is adapted to children, and the whole can be used by the young without impropriety, thus measuring the book by the use that can be made of it, you feel that it more than fills the place of much larger books. For cottage and preaching meetings it is wholly useless. Its title expresses most truly what it is—a book for children, and for children only.

COMMUNION MUDDLE.

THE Editor of the *Christian Standard* answers certain questions relating to the confusion which, to some extent, prevails on the other side of the Atlantic in the matter of the Memorial Feast. Our accomplished Editor is with those who would perpetuate and, we presume, increase the confusion. The subject is noticed solely because the questions indicate that the wildest and worst form of Mixed Communion is already reached. When Jer. Smith filled several columns of the *Review*, in reply to one of our letters to the disciples in America, we took occasion to show that, taking his ground, the Church is bound to commune with the worst characters (including excluded members) who may please

to participate. If the table is the Lord's, and, therefore, none but the Lord himself has a right to debar, then, of course, all who will come may come, fit or unfit, and the Church has no alternative. But let us hear the *Standard*. One who signs himself "*A Subscriber*," asks—

"1. Is it consistent with the word of God to invite or encourage persons to commune with us when we would not receive them into the Church as members?"

2. Have we authority to admit any who have not repented and been baptized into Jesus Christ?"

The *second* question, the Editor says, "needs no answer, as it is understood that we have not to make terms of admission into the Church, but to insist upon those which are revealed." Very good. But how

do we know what those revealed terms are? It is nowhere declared that an unbaptized man shall not be allowed membership in the Church. We shall be told in reply that we are not tied down to precepts, and commands; that examples, approved by the apostles, are equally binding and equally well indicate the law of the Lord. Very good again! So, then, we *debar* the unbaptized from membership in the Church without a single command authorizing us so to do, and that because, in this particular, we find the rule of membership in the recorded facts, which show that the baptized were received and furnish no example of the admission of the unbaptized. A very excellent rule. The Editor of the *Standard* is upon safe ground in reference to the query—who shall we receive into Church membership? But then the other question springs up—with whom shall we partake in the breaking of the bread? Suppose we put it into the words of “A Subscriber”—“Have we authority to admit [to the table] any who have not repented and been baptized into the name of Jesus Christ?” Now, will the *Standard* give the same answer as to the former application of the words? Will its Editor again say, “We have not to make terms but to insist upon those which are revealed?” Whether he say “yes” or “no,” the contradiction is equally apparent. If yes, then there is no command to any unbaptized person to partake of the feast, and no example of any one doing so. If no, then why are we tied down to the rule of approved examples or apostolic commands in regard to membership, and at liberty to act in defiance of examples and in the absence of commands in regard to the table? The true answer is, “Muddle!”

But what is the *Standard's* reply to the *first* query—“Is it consistent with the word of God to invite or encourage persons to commune

whom we would not receive as Church members?” The answer divides itself into three parts—1. “Substitute *sing, pray, and preach, for commune*, and whatever answer may be rightfully given in one case may be given in the other.” Now, why go round the question thus? Why substitute anything? The enquiry is a proper one—one, too, very needful to be answered. But the Editor does answer the question—he immediately adds, “*It is not consistent to invite or encourage persons to share in any part of Christian worship or duty whom we would not receive into the Church.*” The answer is plain, but it only lands us in more muddle, because the course advocated by those who act with the Editor *does* encourage persons to share in Christian worship and duty whom they would not receive as members. When the deacon, or other Church member, puts before, or into the hand of, persons whom you would not receive into membership the receptacle for the appointed contribution (which it is the *duty* of every Christian to attend to), those persons are directly encouraged to share in that part of Christian duty. If we pay for bread and wine and then, by the hand of a deacon or other member (precisely in the same way as to members), put the loaf and the cup before, or into the hands of, persons to whom we refuse membership, we do encourage them to share in Christian worship. Yet we are told, by those who advocate so doing, that “it is *not* consistent to encourage persons, whom we would not receive into the Church, to share in *any part of Christian worship or duty.*” There is but one escape—that of declaring contribution to the treasury of the Church not a part of “*Christian duty,*” and the Breaking of the Bread not a part of “*Christian worship.*” But the *Standard* will not consent to escape by that door; so nothing remains but confusion confounded.

But we must give the whole of the *Standard's* answer, or there may be a charge of unfairness. After showing, as above, what is not consistent, the softening clauses come in—"Yet there are many who, although we would not receive them into the Church, yet possess such faith and piety that if they voluntarily sing and pray, or partake of the Lord's Supper, they do not seriously disturb us by so doing. They ought, in full recognition of their spiritual worth, to be instructed in the way of the Lord more perfectly; and, generally, proper faithfulness and kindness will bring them right." We are thus told that the doing, in *many* cases, of that which the Editor declares "*not consistent*" does not *much disturb* him. This can only be accounted for in one of two ways—either he is indifferent to right and wrong, and is not disturbed by doing what is "*not consistent*;" or, with him, the whole question is in confusion. That he is a truly honorable Christian, wishful to be right and to do right, has never been our lot to doubt. The other alternative, then, only remains—with our friend, so far as this question is concerned, confusion reigns supreme.

Then we are told of the many who possess such faith and piety that it matters but little if they do commune. But really faith and piety only increases the confusion. Will our friend receive them into Church-membership? If he can make faith and piety *alone* stand for faith, piety, and baptism in the one case, why can he not in the other? Then, too, the practice he defends has nothing to do with faith and piety. It no more makes them essential than it makes baptism so. It dispenses alike with faith, repentance, baptism, and piety. It says, "There—we spread the table and hand you the elements; we neither invite nor debar; we know some of you have little faith and less piety, but

we do not debar; "Let every one examine himself and so let him eat." Then we are told, that, "generally, proper faithfulness and kindness will bring them right." But this, too is entirely out of place, and merely lands us where an apostle forbids us to stand—doing evil that good may come. And, further, this is, at best, but an evasion of the true issue, because it is admitted that faithfulness and kindness do not *always* bring them right. What of those who do not yield? May they be excluded? Not at all—the plea is, "We do not debar"—"It is not our table." Then all talk about piety and subsequent surrender is only as so much dust, thrown up to the creating of blindness and confusion. Those may talk of piety whose rule is to admit only the pious; but those who participate with everyone who comes, on the ground that each decides for himself and takes the responsibility, have no right to shelter themselves under the wing of alleged piety, the existence of which is not imposed as a condition. We know Baptist Churches which admit unbaptized persons to commune, but require evidence, of some kind, that the applicants are devoted to the Lord. Those churches could defend their practice on the ground of the piety of the participants, but not so those who act with the Editor of the *Standard*.

In another issue the Editor has again to deal with the question. One of his correspondents writes:—

"Several months ago the Church at this place, after a first and second admonition, rejected a heretic. Ever since his rejection he has been communing as though he had never been rejected. He does not receive the emblems from the hands of the deacons, but from members seated beside him. His conduct annoys some of the brethren, who, on observing his course, are compelled to think of him and his communing, in place of examining themselves, thus disqualifying themselves to commune. This case has afforded ample opportunity for members of other churches and citizens of this community generally, to ridicule, as they

say, our 'loose manner of observing the institution of the Lord's Supper.' This is a practical illustration of the teaching, 'We neither invite nor reject,' etc.

Question.—What is the remedy in this case? Is it the duty of the elders to inform this person privately, or publicly, if need be, that the emblems are not prepared for him, and that he has neither part nor lot in them, and that it is therefore expected that he will not partake of them?

R. A. KEEN."

This case certainly justifies our assertion, that the *worst* form of open communion is already reached. A rejected heretic communes in spite of his rejection by the Church—he sits with the members who have excluded him; they give him the emblems; and other citizens look on and ridicule. And well they may. But the enquirer asks, "whether the elders should inform this heretic that the elements are not prepared for him, and that he has no part or lot in them." What says the Editor in reply? This—"It would be proper, if his conduct gives offence, to tell him plainly that his course is offensive, and request him to desist. If he still persist it would be proper to state publicly their disapproval, and protest against it. Beyond this, as there is involved no disturbance or interference with the Church in the performance of duty, we do not think it advisable to go." In this case and in the answer, inconsistency seems to have gone about as far as is possible. Members hand the man the elements and the elders are to tell him he has no part or lot in them! "If his conduct give offence it would be proper to request him to desist." Above the Editor had said, "It is certainly disorderly for an excluded member to join in the worship of the Church." How then can disorderly conduct in the Church be other than an offence? Yet it is simply put, "If his conduct gives offence." But here we deny the right of elders or Church "to request him to desist." What right have they so to request if the table is not theirs; if they are neither em-

powered to "invite nor debar?" According to the *Standard* theory the man has a right to be there, whether fit or not. If unfit he will have to give an account to God, and he may eat and drink to his own condemnation; but, as between himself and his fellow men, he has a right which none may dispute. The Editor seems practically to admit this, for, after protesting he does not think it advisable to do more.

We cannot but protest against the muddle consequent upon mixing up all sorts of people when the disciples come together to break the bread. Why should those who ought to partake and those who ought not, those who come to do so and those who do not come for that purpose, all intermingle so as to pass the elements before, or over the knees, or into the hands of those who should not have them and who do not want them? If it were written, "Do all your things in disorder," this confusion would be the perfection of obedience. Let those for whom the elements are provided sit together, and apart from those who are not invited, and then all the miserable confusion which the above case indicates will be prevented.

But the Editor has a fortress into which the advocates of mixed communion can escape at all times. He begins his answer to the last cited enquirer pretty much as to the other—"We are somewhat surprised at the frequency with which questions are propounded respecting a participation, on the part of unworthy persons, in the Lord's Supper. We have never yet been questioned as to such persons praying, or singing, or joining in the contributions . . . thanksgivings, supplications, and adorations are just as exclusively Christian as the Lord's Supper. An excluded person has no right to join in any of them, and the Church has no right to encourage him to do so." But the Editor should remember that what is true of the excluded

is also true of those who have never entered the kingdom. But then, as we have seen, when you seat them with the members, receive their contributions (which they could not give if you did not please to receive) and *give* them the elements, you do *encourage* them. Then be it distinctly understood, that though the Editor, to make wrong-doing in one direction easy, throws all the items together, they are not at all equal. People not in the kingdom have a right to be present to behold the worship and order of the Church. If we provide accommodation for them as spectators and give no encouragement to participate in the worship, we are not responsible for anything they may do, which we cannot pre-

vent. If they sing without the slightest encouragement from us, and against our protest, then, truly, we have no responsibility in the case. But in the breaking of the bread no one can partake unless we please to aid him. It is ours to give the elements to whom we will, and if we give them we *encourage* them to partake.—We may say in such case, that we “noither invite nor debar;” but, in so saying, we speak not truly, for an invitation by deed is as really invitation as is one in words. Reader! If you have leanings to “Open Communion,” look at the foregoing picture, and see what you are likely to come to!

D. K.

HELP FOR CHAPEL BUILDING.

THAT Churches and individuals can do a good work occasionally by helping to erect suitable meeting places cannot be doubted. Indeed it would be a good thing had we always on hand an effort to promote, by contributions from brethren generally, the erection of a chapel or two. But, desirable as this may appear to most readers, we are confident, that were some small Church, in ordinary circumstances, to put forth an appeal to the brotherhood for help in erecting a truly proper and desirable building, the response would do but little more than pay the cost of printing and postage. Now, what is the cause of this? Could we not, by timely aid in this way, cause a building to be erected, say every second year, in some locality where otherwise opportunities for good work would be lost? Why is it not done? Is it because there is not ability and will to do it? We think not. What then? Because applications are not made under circumstances that prove the expediency of the work and guarantee the proper carrying out of the undertaking. A Church of, comparatively

speaking, few members, having no fit place to meet in, feels deeply the want of a suitable building, and a circular is sent to all the Churches. But the brethren who receive the application, and (wishful really to do the most possible good with what they are able to give) ask themselves a few questions, such as—1. Is this Church likely to realize the object—if I send £5 will it merely find its way into a savings bank, and, if not swallowed up by vain efforts to get more, be voted to some other purpose by the next generation? 2. If the required sum be obtained is the Church applying for it really competent to transact the various business necessary to the erection and security of the proposed building? 3. Is the Church thus appealing for help known to have established such reputation for concord, earnestness, and faithful and intelligent presentation of the faith and order of the Church of Christ as render it desirable to bring it into greater publicity? Certainly we would not recommend any one to give money towards building a chapel unless these three questions can be fairly answered in

the affirmative. Nor will it prove satisfactory, in most instances, to leave the applicants to answer for themselves. Would it not be wise to require that each application be supported by the recommendation of two or three Churches which have examined the condition and prospects; or by a committee appointed for the purpose—say by the Annual Meeting, or in some other way, so as to carry weight and give reliable testimony?

We submit these considerations, and to a certain extent shall forthwith act upon them. We shall give no contributions for chapel-building unless in the three particulars, named above, there be satisfactory testimony from competent persons other than the Church applying—

we shall recommend the Church with which we may be at the time of any such application so to act—we shall advertize in the *B. H.* freely, and without charge, all such commended applications and specify them as such, while all others will be charged as advertisements, and by their place among those that are paid for will certify that the application is commended only by the applicants themselves.

We do wish to promote chapel building, and in this way it is not unlikely that the object may, in some measure, be promoted. Let it be clearly understood that these remarks are not aimed at cases under notice in the past. The future only is in view. Ed.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

1. Hymn 195, in the New Hymn Book, makes us sing, that *Jesus entered heaven with all our names engraven on his breast*. Is not this improper; savouring greatly of Calvinistic Election?

J. H. N.

THE enquirer reads poetry as he would the prosaic records of a police court. The poet never intended to be understood as meaning that names were actually engraven upon the breast of our High Priest; and no one, who enters into the spirit of the hymn, understands anything of the sort. But were it affirmed that the names of all the saved were written before the creation of the world there would be no Calvinism in the affirmation, that is to say, if by Calvinism the enquirer mean something necessarily opposed to Scripture. Such an affirmation, if made, would only imply the foreknowledge of God, leaving out of the question the free-agency of man. I *know* beforehand that many things will occur which I do not compel, and God knows and, therefore, could record, all the events of the future.

The sentiment that Christ bears the names of His Church upon His breast is consolatory in the extreme. No one understands it literally. He loved His Church and gave Himself for it, before it existed; and, as the High Priest carried the names of the twelve tribes upon His breastplate, which names covered the whole nation, so every member of Christ's body has a place

in His heart, never to be neglected or forgotten. Poetry must be treated as poetry; if you bring it down to the dry literality of every-day talk you may burn all the hymn books and obliterate the Psalms of David.

2. Should a drunkard be retained in the Church? What constitutes a man a drunkard?

M.

The first question needs no answer. Everybody understands that the Church is forbidden to commune with drunkards, liars, fornicators, &c. It is, no doubt, presented as a sort of peg, on which to hang the second question.

A drunkard is a person *addicted* to drunkenness; so say our dictionaries, and they are sustained by common usage. But what is drunkenness? There are a few men, very intemperate in their use of language, who say that he is a drunkard who takes intoxicating drink even in the smallest quantity. They insist that if a pint of wine make a man very drunk, a half-pint must make him half drunk, or a little drunk, and so on down to the smallest quantity. It is only requisite to say, that the words *drunkard* and *drunkenness*, as also their equivalents in other languages, are not applied to the taking intoxicating drink in quantities however small; and that the man who so applies them does so with no more right than he who confounds the words *elephant* and *mouse* by using the one in place of the other.

We are not at all looking at the question whether it is safe and good habitually to

take small quantities of intoxicating drink. If we were to should pronounce such taking neither safe nor good, and sustain our verdict by unanswerable facts. But we have now nothing to do with that enquiry. The question is one of discipline and church membership. We are bound to withdraw from the fellowship of the drunkard, and if taking intoxicating drink in the smallest quantity ensures drunkenness then must we withdraw from all who do not entirely abstain. But we dare not exclude from the table of the Lord any subject in His kingdom unless the Law of the Lord defines his offence and appoints such withdrawal as its penalty. We could even admit that the effect of small quantities of intoxicating drink are always bad and undesirable, and yet be no nearer a right to exclude the person taking them. "Drunkenness" is never applied to represent any physical condition short of that in which there is apparent, as the result of recent drinking, mental derangement, or partial inability to control the members of the body.—Whatever previous states drinking may bring the man through, and however undesirable and reprehensible such conditions

may be, they must be designated by their proper names, and the words *drunkard* and *drunkenness* must be reserved to do their own duties and not be thrust into places they do not belong to, at the dictation of fancy or excited zeal.

3. Is not the justifying the ungodly by faith of Rom. iv. opposed to Paul's own justification, Acts xxii.?

TRUTH SEEKER.

Justifying the ungodly by faith is *not* opposed to Paul's own justification, for Paul's faith was counted to him for righteousness. Abraham's justification was by faith; but the faith which justifies is not a mere cold, formal, inoperative assent. It is a faith which *works* by love, and, as James says in the case of Abraham, is made perfect by works. Abraham believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness, but had he not gone out, as God commanded, his faith would not have been thus counted—afterward, had he believed the promise of God and yet refused to offer Isaac, he would then have made shipwreck of faith. Paul to Romans, Paul on his own conversion, and James, are perfectly in accord.

SECULARISM IN DARWEN.

CERTAINLY the Editor of the *B. H.* had no intention of pursuing Messrs. Bradlaugh and Watts into Lancashire. But somehow his name was there used without his consent or knowledge. The result has been a challenge to debate with Mr. Bradlaugh, repetition on his part of his former shuffling, the circulation of 1000 copies of the *Bedlington Exposure*, lectures by Mr. Watts, and a long newspaper controversy concerning the proposed debate; the concluding letter of which is all we can find room for:—

To the Editor of the Blackburn Times.—

"SIR,—Messrs. Bradlaugh and Blacker might as well have saved time and trouble by leaving my first note to you unanswered. I intimated therein exactly what Mr. Bradlaugh would not do and what he would propose, and his note of last week closes the matter by refusing and proposing precisely as I intimated he would.

He absolutely refuses to arrange for the discussion of the five questions; offers to do so for the first only; declares three nights debate with me enough, and thus shows that in intimating, the week before, that the other questions could be afterwards

arranged, that he was endeavouring to dupe us; and he refused the proposed written debate by insisting upon an absurd and previously refuses condition, *i.e.*, that it be printed in the *Reformer*. Mr. Bradlaugh deems it requisite in each communication to refer to my "impertinences." Poor man! The sore place is really this—he knows that my "impertinences" are exceedingly *pertinent*, consisting in my calling things by their right names. When I *do* imply that a certain man is a trickster, depend upon it that that man knows I have the proof. But, sir, what a funny man Mr. Blacker is! In the same page on which Mr. Bradlaugh declines to accept my challenge both for the platform and for the press, he asks, "Will Mr. King at once appoint his committee that we may get to business?" What business? That of arranging for a discussion which his chief refuses to arrange for! Mr. Blacker, however, agrees with me that his last letter is a curiosity, but he intimates that you have made it so by omitting part of it. But I am sure, sir, he does you injustice in putting it thus. It is certainly impossible for the omitted part to contain anything which could take the "curious" out of the portion that appeared. His last effort only increases the curiosity. He charged me with insisting upon conditions that I knew *could not* be complied with, and gave but one item in proof—that of demanding nine *consecutive* nights. I put

him right by saying that I never proposed anything of the sort, and gave at once Mr. Bradlaugh the choice of any nights he might please, Sundays excepted, so that the debate be concluded within a month of its commencement. Had Mr. Blacker been a sensible man he would have said "I beg pardon, perceiving that on that point I was in a mistake." Instead of so doing, he starts out to prove that I did propose conditions, knowing they could not be accepted. This he does by showing that my first letter intimated my conviction that Mr. Bradlaugh would not accept. Of course it did; I knew as well then as I do now, that he would not accept conditions to secure a full and fair debate, covering the entire ground, and so arranged as to facilitate its production as a volume. Mr. Blacker, then is in blissful ignorance of the difference between "will not" and "cannot." I know that a certain swindler will not meet a bill due to-morrow though he has money enough and to spare. "If you know that," says Mr. Blacker, in effect, "you know that said swindler cannot take up the bill." I know nothing of the sort, sir. What a man will not do and what he cannot do stand distinctly separate. If Mr. Blacker does not know this he should not attempt writing for the public. There are several items of like sapient reasoning; but your readers will have had their laugh over them ere this, and thereby have rendered it unnecessary for me to cite more than the above specimen. One point, however, demands a word or two. He says that Mr. King should be the last to talk of slander, and then goes on to imply that in two particulars I slander Mr. Bradlaugh. He says that I designate Mr. B. a "professional reviler of Christ," at the time that I profess to know nothing of his position or employment. He asks how, if I know that much, I can profess to know nothing? Suppose that I say "I know nothing of Mr. Jones's pursuits, except that he spends some of his evenings at the public-house." Some man replies, "If you know that he spends some time at the public-house, it cannot be true that you know nothing of his pursuits; and if you know nothing about his pursuits you cannot know that he

frequents the beershop; you therefore slander him." Of course I should stare at the reasoner, and, concluding that he had come from the beershop, or suffered from derangement of the brain, pass on with a kindly smile indicative of pity for the poor unfortunate. No one will consider that I should do otherwise in Mr. Blacker's case. But he should be careful how he creates charges of slander out of his own futile efforts at reasoning. This point I would not have referred to but for its connection with another. "In the name of truth" he demands that I withdraw the libel, or prove that Mr. Holyoake has intimated what I have alleged as to the contaminating influence of the *Reformer*. He demands that I withdraw my statement or prove when and where Mr. Holyoake so intimated. Now this looks big, but is exceedingly foolish. It proves Mr. Blacker to be very unwise or very dishonest. If unacquainted with the circumstances then he plays the part of a simpleton. If acquainted with them, then he acts the knave in denying what cannot be controverted. But what has Mr. Blacker to do with it? It does not concern him. It concerns Mr. Bradlaugh, who, with my words before him, writes to your paper and does not hint at denial. Let Mr. Bradlaugh deny the statement and I will then send you particulars of page, date, and words, and at the same time tell something more that Mr. Holyoake has said. But until the party concerned denies, it would be absurd to waste your space with particulars. Here, sir, I think I may leave the matter, hoping not to have to trouble you again. At present I am suffering from a severe cold; I hope that a few days will suffice for a recovery, so far as to justify my naming an early time for making myself acquainted with the good people of your neighbourhood, when I shall no doubt delight the Darwen Secularists with some of Mr. Holyoake's edifying words.—Yours truly,
D. KING.

The end, so far, is, that no reply is ventured to the above, and the Editor of the *B. H.* is advertised for a course of lectures, in Darwen, to begin January 30.

GENEROSITY.

"DEAR BR. ALLEN.—Enclosed is Banker's order for the sum of £150, which at the rate of three shillings to the dollar, is equivalent to 1,000 dols. of your currency. I send you this to be given to Bethany College as a token of gratitude for benefits received from reading the works of Alex. Campbell, our late beloved brother and founder of the college—and in remembrance of the Christian courtesy and kind-

ness received by myself and wife during our sojourn in the U. S. in the summer of this year.

"Praying to the Father of all mercy that a cordial and loving feeling may be increased throughout the Christian Brotherhood, both in this country and America, I am.—Yours truly,
T. COOP."

Wigan, England, Nov., '69.

Br. Coop will pardon the liberty I take

in thus making public a letter entirely *private*. It is not done to parade his name as a *donor* of Bethany College, nor in any way to give him conspicuity as a man, in any of the business relationships of life; but because of the grateful recognition of spiritual benefits, and the unequivocal manifestation of the pure, disinterested generosity which it evinces.

We are made to rejoice, almost daily, over instances of men moved by noble impulses to make generous provision for benevolent institutions, in their immediate locality, or where, by reason of birth, business successes, long residence, or some other personal consideration, they are especially attached. This is all well, and for such deeds they are deservedly held, by their fellow men, as public benefactors. But it is certainly more in harmony with the spirit of Christianity that our gifts should be prompted alone by *love*, from the character of the object, independent of any controlling influence arising from local

preference. In this view of the case, the above gift, coming as it does over the great waste of waters, from one of English birth, citizenship and business connections, to an institution whose object is thus complimented, possesses a character, the value of which is not to be estimated by the dollars and cents in which it is reckoned—liberal though they be.

This donation of Br. Coop is made to constitute him one of the ten founders of our "Commencement Hall," and while we thank him for his noble act, we can but earnestly hope that a few more brethren will, like him, come forward and enable us, much to their praise, to speedily complete this work.

Brother and Sister Coop's brief visit in May last, will long be remembered by us, with great pleasure, as cultivating a union of affection which distance cannot divide.

A. ALLEN.

From the Bethany Harbinger.

REMOVED TO WHERE THERE IS NOT A CHURCH.

To the Editor of the *B.H.*—Dear Sir,—I am one of those shut out from Christian fellowship by necessary removal to where there is not a Church of New Testament faith and order. I have been thus placed for several years. My heart responded

most joyfully to your suggestions last month, and I trust that they may be carried out. Truly, none but those who are placed as I have been can know the deep pure joy of Christian intercourse. Yours in the one hope. E.

AN EVANGELIST FOR MELBOURNE.

DEAR BR. KING,—After careful consideration I have decided to accept the invitation to go out to Australia, upon which brethren there commissioned you

to communicate with me. I shall sail D.V. so soon as I can make necessary arrangements. With kind love, I remain, yours truly, in Jesus. WM. HINDLE.

ITEMS OF NEWS.

SPAIN.—The Spanish revolution has at least opened a door for Gospel, where a year or so ago it was shut out completely. The following will show how, in this respect, things now move:—"In the Fair held at Barcelona during Christmas week, the agent of the National Bible Society of Scotland opened a tent for the sale of the Scriptures. This roused the indignation of some Church officials, who did all in their power to excite a riot among the people. The current of public opinion is indicated in the following extracts from *La Razon*, a small daily paper published in the town, whose editor says, under date 23rd December:—"In the public plaza of the town there has been erected a pretty tent, from which there are sold Bibles and other Protestant books at an excessively low price. Yesterday afternoon, some fanatical sacristans caused a perfect scandal by presuming to interfere

with the sale. The ridiculous presumption of the sacristans who presumed to prohibit the sale of Protestant books caused a veritable riot, which excited no little alarm among the peaceable passers-by. Some unhappy persons, who think they serve God when robbing their neighbour—and certainly to take books which are for sale without wishing to pay for them is, according to us, a robbery—after vainly menacing the sellers, took some of the books and ill-treated the salesman. Some peaceable spectators took part in the affair. The tumult increasing, several agents of police seized on those who were most excited, who indeed appeared to be possessed, and conducted them to the police office. Among those who were arrested, we are assured, were the sacristan of the Cathedral, and the sacristan of one of the Parish Churches. The Alcalde, Senor Solerly Matas, endeavoured to res-

train those who were so excited, but it was impossible. He did, however, as much as was in his power. The bystanders behaved nobly." The correspondent of the National Bible Society gives the following account of the affair:—"It seemed indeed at one time as though we should have been torn to pieces. They did their best to destroy the tent. One fellow raised a large club and heaved a deadly blow at the guard. Another guard seized him and took him before the Mayor. He proved to be the chief sacristan of the Cathedral. An old priest, one of the leaders in the late Carlist rising, came up to the tent and in my face cried out, "Embustero, embustero! Liar, liar!" The people cried, "No, no! you are the liar!" I stood upon a box and begged them to be still. Then taking off my hat I said to him, "Do, sir, come up here and say what you please; I have no greater pleasure than to meet my opposers face to face." The people seconded this, and after a while he came up and cried, "Tell us, then, when and where your religion was born?" I was going into the matter when he interrupted. The people cried, "Do not interrupt the stranger; let him reply!" Many ordered him to be gone; and as I went on he excused himself on the plea that he had to visit a sick person. Then we fell to selling Gospels as fast as Fernando, Francisco, my wife, myself, and another could despatch them. In the three days we sold more than 20,000 Gospels."

AUSTRALIA. — MELBOURNE.—The cause of Christ continues to progress; indeed so much so, that our Baptist friends, in their Magazine, lament our rapid increase. In their last issue they make a grave charge against us in a leading article, "*Is Baptism essential?*" One reason given for the discussion of the subject is the fact, that "a body of people calling themselves '*Disciples of Christ*' have sprung up, whose teaching on this subject is utterly opposed to Scripture, injurious to the interests of true religion, and subversive even of morality, and who are doing the work of Satan more effectually than either priest or pope." One of the editors of this paper is a preacher who was, a short time ago, remarkably friendly—some had hope that he and the church over which he presides would soon be identified with us. But now it appears he would exterminate us. The cause here is too firmly established to be injured by such attacks. The able teaching of our Evangelists, Brs. Surber and Carr, has so established the minds of brethren on this and kindred subjects, that such attacks only tend to strengthen us. We are thankful that we have men amongst us who have both courage and ability to meet, in a fair

field, any opponents. It is the intention of Brs. Surber and Carr to answer publicly this article next Lord's day evening, and also to send to the Baptist paper a reply.

A. THOMSON.

BRAUMARIE.—On Thursday, Sept. 23rd, six persons were baptized unto the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. On the following Lord's-day they were received into the fellowship of the Church.

W. RUSE.

ADELAIDE.—Oct. 24. During the past month *eight* have been added to the Church.

H. S. R.

HINDMARSH.—Oct. 23. We have to report *five* additions.

T. P.

MILANG.—Oct. 20. During the past month *five* more have been buried with the Lord in baptism.

S. J.

STIRLING EAST.—Oct. 18. On the 14th instant, *six* believers were buried with the Lord by immersion before a large audience.

G. G.

STRATHALBYN.—On Oct. 3, I preached here. During the week I preached twice; also twice on the following Lord's day; *four* decided for Christ. And at

WILLUNGA, during the past month, *two* have been added by faith and baptism.

H. S. E.

AMERICA.—From the various publications of the brethren in America it appears that the truth is winning its way. There are now some twenty-five periodicals, including four or five published weekly, devoted to Christianity as it was at the first. In the *American Christian Review* alone there were reported in one year, ending May last, 30,254 additions. The *Christian Missionary Society* has been remodelled, or rather abolished, and a very general co-operation of churches substituted, with every promise of large results. There is now no society, no membership, but co-operation, much as we have it here, but upon a vast scale, calling into operation committees for the separate States, and also a General Committee.

D. K.

NOTTINGHAM DISTRICT ASSOCIATION.—The Churches of this Association came together on the 25th December, in Barker-gate Chapel, when E. Manfull was called to preside. It was announced, that the Church, formerly meeting in Comyn Street, Nottingham, had united with the Christian Church in Barker-gate. It was resolved that the church in Ruddington be no longer considered as belonging to the district. E. Goddard was re-appointed to attend to the correspondence requisite to the plan making. Brethren reported as to the work of the Lord in the Churches in Brinsley, Bulwell, Carlton, Green Hill, Marehay, Langley, Loughborough, and Nottingham. From Leicester

and Lincoln there was neither representative nor report. Derby reported by letter. Letters were read from Brn. Evans (Evangelist), Dawson, of Bulwell, and G. Blair, of Nottingham. The Churches in Derby, and Green Hill, certified to the labours of Ed. Evans. The intimations generally were of the existence of peace and harmony. Several pleasing intimations of increase were also communicated. It was stated that activity had prevailed in the Nottingham Church in sending the Gospel around—eighty-one journeys, over 1,912 miles, by road and rail, having been made during the year. The evening closed with the usual tea meeting and divers addresses by brethren of the district.

LIVERPOOL.—Br. Strang having now left us, it becomes our duty to report progress made up to the time of his departure, which took place on the 21st December. Since report in August we have been cheered and gratified by the addition to our number of eight by confession and baptism and one formerly baptized. Two of the eight are the youngest son and daughter of Elder Collin, who has now the joy of seeing all his children (nine in number) united with the Church. Since the annual meeting Br. Strang has spent six weeks in Leicester, two weeks in Southport, and the rest of the time in Liverpool, labouring on with that earnestness and faithfulness which have so prominently characterised the efforts he has put forth for the salvation of sinners, during the period he has been labouring amongst us; may he long be spared to work in the vineyard of the Lord, and may his labours, now on the banks of the Tyne, be largely successful in the ingathering of precious souls into the fold of the Redeemer.

J. CARBUTHERS.

DERBY.—During the last quarter I have toiled on through many untoward circumstances in the Churches of this district. We have been alternately cheered and disheartened, but still plodding on, hoping even against hope that eternity will disclose results now unknown, which will prove a "crown of rejoicing." Twelve souls have been added to the Churches. I greatly rejoice in additions to the saved; but I am confident that there is a work to be done

in most Churches of equal importance. A thorough understanding of New Testament Ministry and a prudent, firm, loving conformity thereto, are essential to the increase of our numbers, and to the after nurture and preservation of that increase. Slow work, yet busily and surely done, will achieve more for our generation and the ages to come than exciting revivals with little knowledge of, and respect for, Church ministry and worship, as they were once delivered for all time. ED. EVANS.

BLACKBURN.—I have just returned from a short visit to the Churches in *Preston* and *Blackburn*, and I have been much cheered by the hearty co-operation of the brethren in these places in the Lord's work. Five have been baptized and added to the Church in Blackburn since our last notice, and I think there never was a better prospect for the Church there than at present. May the Lord keep this little flock very near to Himself in holiness of heart and life; and may they walk together in love for His dear name's sake. W. HINDLE.

WREXHAM.—The Church in King's St. has been refreshed this month by one interesting immersion. E. M.

BURY.—We had last month an assault by Mr. Bradlaugh, who came to Bury to lecture. We had reprinted 1,300 copies of the Bedlington exposure of Messrs. Bradlaugh and Watts, which we gave away at his lectures, here and at other places. Infidel lectures not having been delivered here for some time, he had large attendances at 2d., and by selling publications, small and dear, a good amount of money was pocketed. T. B.

Obituary.

FALLEN ASLEEP IN JESUS.

JANE THOMAS, of Birmingham, aged twenty-six. She was immersed in 1862, and has till her death, in December last, continued a faithful follower of the Lord and a devoted member of the Church.

MARY ANN WHEELDON, on January 1st, 1870, aged thirty-four years. She was immersed August, 1868, and has enjoyed the love and esteem of the Church in Summer Lane till the Lord was pleased to call her away.

The Family Room.

THE CUP AND THE SPRING.

WHEN the great African traveller, Bruce, was seeking the source of the Nile, his excitement grew intense. He was told, "Yonder, just by that green hillock, is the spot where the river takes its rise." Fatigue, pain, thirst—all were forgotten in the immediate prospect of reaching the

goal of his ambition. Forward he rushed; he reached the spot said to be the cradle of the mighty river of Egypt. He filled a cup, and drank of the infant waters.

It was a proud moment. Here was the fruit of all his toil. The coveted prize was his. He gazed upon a sight which no other European had ever beheld. His energy, devotion, perseverance, and courage had at length found their reward. Who would not have envied the feelings of the explorer of the Nile?

But, lo! while the cup was yet in his hand, a change came over his spirit. "And is this all?" he asked himself. "Is this the reward of all my weary journeyings,—of my hunger and thirst, and want and peril? True, I stand where no European has ever yet stood; yet what am I? A houseless wanderer, a thousand miles from home—the home I may never see again." And the great traveller felt sad and sick at heart.

There is nothing uncommon in Bruce's experience. Hundreds of ardent young spirits have toiled and laboured to attain some long-cherished object, and in the hour of triumph have felt their joy as transient and their disappointment as keen as his. Who, among all the students in Cambridge, did not look upon Henry Martyn as the most enviable of men, when they hailed him senior wrangler—first mathematician of his year? Yet what are his own words? He had striven for the mastery in the contest for academic fame, and he had come forth victorious; but "I found," he says, "that I had grasped a shadow."

These are prominent instances, youthful reader; but let us ask, has not something similar occurred in the little circle of your own experience? Can you not recall many long-expected enjoyments, which, like the Eastern fruit, looked fair and tempting till you grasped them, and then crumbled to dust in your hand?

Why is this? Were earthly pleasures given only to tantalize us? Were we born to disappointment? Or are we altogether wrong in making such things the objects of pursuit at all?

Surely not, dear friends, surely not. He that formed the eye made forms of grace and beauty for it to look upon; He that fashioned the ear is the Author of all sweet sounds and delightful harmonies; and He that made the heart to long for happiness, designed, we may be sure, that its longings should not be left unsatisfied.

Then why these failures? Why do so many of our youth, cradled in comforts and nourished with numberless blessings, find that life's business leads only to moral bankruptcy? How is it that so few are able to cry, with the old philosopher, "I have found it! I have found it!" having solved the great problem of earthly happiness?

The mistake, young reader, lies in a false estimate of earthly good. The problem which Archimedes studied and solved was this,—What was the true value of a certain crown? The question for you and me to answer is, What is the true value of worldly happiness? Many try to make the calculation, but their results are erroneous, and, when practically carried out, disastrous, if not fatal.

This world is full of blessings. Your experience during the past year abundantly proves this. A Father's hand has given you "all things richly to enjoy." And yet it may be that you have not yet found true peace and happiness, not even in the enjoyment of the good creatures of God. And why? Simply because the things of earth, though they can please, cannot truly satisfy. The world is only a *cup*,—a cup of blessing to those who rightly use it,—but *only* a cup; soon emptied, its sweets soon gone. The heart needs a *spring*, pure, fresh, exhaustless, ever full; and *this*, earth cannot afford.

In the heat of an Eastern noon, a weary pilgrim sits by a well-side, and begs a draught of its cooling waters from one who comes hither to draw. The boon is granted, but not without an expression of surprise that it should have been asked, for there is no kindly intercourse between the nations to which the giver and the receiver respectively belong. And then the stranger speaks to her, no longer as a suppliant, but in tones of solemn majesty,—“If thou knewest who it is that saith to thee, ‘Give me to drink,’ thou wouldst have asked of Him, and He would have given thee living water.” Perplexing statement! “Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep. It was the gift of our father Jacob; hast thou better waters than these?” Mark the response. “Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again; but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be *in him* a well of water, springing up into everlasting life.”

“*Shall thirst again!*” True picture of earthly blessings. The cup is emptied, and the drinker thirsts again. But there is a spring whose waters fail not, a well that is never dry; and now, as on the day when

the woman of Sychar came forth with her waterpot, the gift is His who gave to her the living water. Now, as then, He awaits the humble request, “Give me this water that I thirst not.”

Shall not this petition, dear reader, rise from your heart to-day? You are solemnly reminded that your *own life* is rapidly passing away. The season of trial, the time allotted to make the grand experiment, is drawing shorter and shorter. If failure be the result, there can be no “trying again.” And yet more solemn is the thought, that failure here involves eternal disappointment. If you thoughtlessly or wilfully choose to seek for a spring of unfailing happiness in an earthly cup, you will assuredly thirst again.

Seek, beloved youth, without a moment’s delay the never-failing spring. In humble faith, repair to the cross, look on Him whom your sins have pierced, and in that stream of atoning blood behold the price He pays for the living waters which alone can satisfy your longing heart. Hear Him cry, in that mysterious hour, “I thirst!” and remember He thirsted that you, in youth and in age, in life’s last hour, and throughout eternity, might be “abundantly satisfied” with the joy of His salvation.

SOMETHING WORTH KNOWING.

I AM not accustomed to talk about my resources, or to tell other people how much I am worth. To do so would be incontestable evidence of silly vanity and purse-pride, from which I hope ever to be preserved.

Indeed, I do not remember that hitherto I have said a word upon the subject to any one, except the gentleman who collects the Income-tax in the neighbourhood where I live, and his inquiries have been so pointed and persevering, that I have been obliged to take him into my confidence, though (this between

ourselves) I have not told even him what I am now intending to tell you.

If you look down the columns of the daily papers you may frequently see advertisements from individuals, who offer, on receipt of sums varying from one shilling to a guinea, to impart valuable secrets, by the knowledge of which any one may easily acquire a fortune; but, inasmuch as these secrets have not made the fortunes of those who advertise them,—else why are they so anxious to clutch a few more paltry shillings

and guineas?—I should recommend you not to invest in what will undoubtedly prove a losing speculation. Keep your money; secrets that anybody may buy are rogues' baits, which only fools will nibble at.

I cannot promise that my secret will enable you to make a fortune, but a very eminent authority has given it as his opinion that its possessor may realize something worth more than £1,000 a year,—an opinion which my experience confirms. It has been worth quite that much to me; so that I am not like the advertisers referred to, about to offer you a secret which I know to be worthless; it is because I have tried and proved its value that I am induced to tell it to you.

Candidly, if I had been asked to set a money value upon this secret, I should have been puzzled to appraise it. But Dr. Johnson, who was accustomed to grapple with difficulties, has made a valuation, and it would of course ill become me to question the judgement of the learned lexicographer.

Some short time ago I was reading one of his works, when I met with this passage:—“*The habit of looking on the best side of a thing is worth more than £1,000 a year to a man.*” “Is it?” I cried, “then I am worth more than £1,000 a year.”

Many instances occurred to me in which difficulties in my path, met in a cheerful spirit, had proved far less serious than they seemed; sorrows, looked at in the light of God's countenance, had lost much of their poignancy; and even deep afflictions, regarded as painful and necessary discipline from a Heavenly Father's hand, had ended in my singing of goodness and mercy; and when I reflected that but for this habit of *looking at the best side of a thing* I might have gone about with my head bowed down like a bulrush,

and my spirit crushed within me, I felt that no amount of wealth could compensate for its loss, and said, “Dr. Johnson was right, it is worth more than £1,000 a year; for it has given me that which £10,000 could not buy,—a cheerful spirit and a happy heart.”

There is a strange readiness manifested by many, I might say most people, in finding out the dark and gloomy features in their life's history, and making themselves miserable by moping over all that has been painful and depressing; blotting out the many bright and sunny spots that would, if looked at, fill their hearts with gladness.

They treasure in their memories a long catalogue of misfortunes, inscribed in good bold characters, easily read, whilst the record of their mercies is a faintly written scrawl, which they have to search for before they can find, and then are at no pains to decipher.

Some trouble comes upon them and sitting down before it, in the gloomy shadow of its darkest side, they pine, and sigh, and murmur at their lot; when, if they would only rise, bestir themselves, and walk round to the other side, they would see a better and a brighter aspect, in the light of which they might look upon it, if not with cheerfulness, at least without despair.

Much of this may arise from constitutional temperament. Some are naturally more reserved, desponding, and peevish in disposition than others; but I am convinced much may be done to overcome this, if by God's help, we try to form the habit of *looking at the best side of a thing*; and no time so suitable for doing this as the season of youth, when habits are more easily formed than in advanced life.

B. C. Mag.

THE CREED OF THE CHURCH.

THE word *faith*, like the word *religion*, is not unfrequently used in three different senses, or at least with three different shades of meaning, in the Bible.

I. *It is sometimes used by metonymy in an objective sense, to denote that system of doctrine which is revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures.* Such is evidently its meaning in the following passages :—

1.—Acts vi. 7 : “And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests became obedient to the *faith*.”

2.—Acts xiii. 8 : “But Elymas the sorcerer withstood them (Paul and Barnabas), seeking to turn away the Deputy from the *faith*.”

3.—Gal. i. 23 : “But they (the Churches in Judea) had only heard, that he (Paul) who persecuted us in times past, now preached the *faith* which he once destroyed.”

4.—Gal. iii. 23 : “But before *faith* came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the *faith* which should afterward be revealed.”

5.—1 Tim. v. 8 : “But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he has denied the *faith*, and is worse than an infidel.”

6.—1 Tim. vi. 10 : “For the love of money is a root of all evil; which while some coveted after, they have erred from the *faith*, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”

7.—Jude 3 : “Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you and exhort you that ye should contend earnestly for the *faith* which was once delivered to the saints.”

II. *Most frequently it is used subjectively, in its literal and proper sense, for that state of the understanding and the heart which causes a man to trust in Christ, and to obey all his commandments.* The following examples will suffice for illustration :—

1.—Matt. viii. 10 : “When Jesus heard it (the remark of the centurion,) he marvelled, and said to them that followed him, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great *faith*, no, not in Israel.”

2.—Matt. ix. 22 : “But Jesus turned about; and when he saw her, he said, Daughter, be of good comfort; thy *faith* hath made thee whole.”

3.—Matt. xv. 28 : “Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O, woman, great is thy *faith*; be it unto thee even as thou wilt.”

4.—Acts vi. 8 : “And Stephen, full of *faith* and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people.”

5.—Rom. x. 17 : “So then *faith* cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.”

6.—Heb. xi. 1 : “Now *faith* is the confidence of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen,” &c.

III. *It is also used sometimes by metonymy for the obedience of faith.* Take, for instance, the following passages :—

1.—Matt. xxiii. 23 : “Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithes of mint, and anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and *faith* (fidelity).”

2.—Rom. i. 8 : “First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ, for you all, that your *faith* (fidelity) is spoken of throughout the whole world.”

3.—Rom. iii. 3 : “For what if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the *faith* (fidelity) of God without effect?”

4.—Gal. v. 22 : “But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, *faith* (fidelity).”

5.—Titus ii. 10 : “Not purloining, (speaking of servants,) but showing all good *fidelity* (πῶρος), that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things.”

6.—Heb. xiii. 7 : “Remember them who have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God; whose *faith* (fidelity) follow, considering the end of their conversation.”

Here, then, we have a sort of trinity in the word *faith*; not properly three separate, independent, and distinct things; but rather three phases and manifestations of one and the same thing. The first of these may, for the sake of distinction, be called *objective faith*, or *faith in the book*;

the second, *subjective* faith, or faith in the heart; and the third, *practical* faith, or faith in the life. The last is but the immediate and necessary effect of the second; and the second is, in like manner, the legitimate effect of the first; so that if we would have true and genuine faith in our lives, we must first have it in our hearts; and if we would have it in our hearts, we must first have it in our Creed. And hence it is that we are brought back to the Bible itself as **THE ONLY PROPER CREED OF THE CHURCH; the only infallible and reliable standard of our faith and practice.** Our faith, subjectively considered, is always liable to be erroneous in many respects; and our practice is likely to be even more so. But the Bible is perfect, as its Divine Author is perfect. And hence it should be our constant aim and effort day by day, to test our thoughts, our words, and our actions, by this divine standard; and to bring them up as near to its requirements as possible, but never to go beyond it. All efforts to transcend this limit are attempts at reformation in the wrong direction; they are the bitter fruits of infidelity, come from what source they may.

Happy, then, thrice happy, would it be for the Church to-day if she had always contended earnestly for the creed delivered to the saints by the inspired Apostles. But the pride of the human heart is amazing. There is a constant inclination on the part of fallen man, weak, frail, and erring as he is, to make his own opinions the standard by which to judge of every thing else. And hence, at an early period, the subjective faith of the Church, or rather of her aspiring bishops and presbyters, was reduced to writing, and in a great measure substituted for the inspired creed of the apostles and prophets. But the evil did not stop here. Very soon different opinions were entertained respecting the meaning of the newly-formed creed; and hence the necessity of again correcting the objective by the subjective. A third creed was formed, and a fourth, and a fifth; but every attempt at creed-making has only served to destroy the unity of the faith, to multiply sects and parties, and to lead away the minds and hearts of the people from the earnest and prayerful study of the Holy Scriptures, which alone are able to make us wise even unto salvation.

And hence it is evident that every attempt to unite the people of God on any human basis must ever prove utterly vain and abortive. The only possible way to accomplish this end is to throw aside all human creeds, and take the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, as our rule of faith and practice.

But I am aware that, just here, some will be ready to urge an objection against the view presented. A man, for instance, they say, applies for membership in a certain Church. He says that he believes the Bible to be the word of God, and the only proper rule of faith and practice. But the elders of the Church ascertain from him that he has totally misapprehended some of its teachings on certain very grave and important practical questions. He believes, for instance, that Jesus Christ is a mere man; that there is no Holy Spirit; that sprinkling is baptism; that when a person becomes a member of a Church he may do just as he pleases, being no longer under law, but under grace, etc. The elders labour in vain in attempting to convince him that he is in error on all these matters; and finally they reject him as one who is wholly unfit for a place in the Church of God. Now, says the objector, do not these elders reject this applicant simply on the ground that their *subjective* faith is different from his? And does not this prove, beyond all doubt, that in *practice* at least, every man's interpretation of the Bible is his creed?

I answer, *no*. He is rejected not by the elders of the Church, but by

the apostles of Christ, who still sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

But let me explain a little just here. It is a self evident fact, that without assuming something we can really prove nothing. This is universally conceded; and hence we have given in every department of literature and science certain axiomatic or self-evident truths, which are not to be proved themselves, but which are constantly used for the purpose of proving other more abstruse and complicated propositions with which they stand connected. Thus, for instance, we say in geometry, that "Things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other." "If to equals, equals be added, the sums will be equal"; "The whole is equal to the sum of all its parts," etc. And, in like manner, we enter upon the study of psychology, by assuming our own personal existence, our own personal identity; that every effect must have an adequate cause, etc. And just so it is in biblical science. It, too, has its self-evident truths and propositions: among which we may, I think, safely rank the following:—

I. *That when God spoke to man, he spoke for the purpose and with the design of being understood.* The contradictory of this proposition is an absurdity.

II. *That every honest man, whose mind has not been biased by the influences of a false education, may, therefore, understand what God has said in the Holy Scriptures, so far as a knowledge of the truth is essential to his own happiness and the happiness of others.* The contradictory of this proposition would imply that God has failed in His purpose.

III. *That the fundamental facts and principles of the Christian faith are not, therefore, proper and legitimate subjects of debate.* True, indeed, some persons may object to them just as they object to almost everything else. Even the evidences of sensation and consciousness are not sufficient to satisfy some minds. But the Bible was not made to suit such *abnormal* cases.

When, therefore, we say that the elders of a Church have a right to reject such persons as pervert, or deny the plainest propositions in the word of God, we claim no more for them than we commonly concede to other men in all the various ranks, pursuits, and relations of life. It is true that they may sometimes err in applying the plainest rules and principles of our creed. And so, also, may the mathematician err in applying the plainest and simplest axioms of geometry; the merchant may err in applying his yard-stick; the surveyor may err in applying his chain and compass; and the farmer may err in the use of his half bushel. But who would thence infer that the farmer measures his grain by his own conceptions of the capacity of a half bushel? or that the surveyor measures his land by his conceptions of a chain and compass? or that the merchant measures his cloth by his conceptions of a yard-stick? Why then, in reason's name, should any one charge the elders of a Church with ignoring the Bible, and making their own conceptions of its plain and simple truths their practical rule and standard in the government and discipline of a Church?

But if any one can not perceive the force of this reasoning let him try the two following syllogisms.

I. *Whoever acts in harmony with the divinely authorized creed will be saved.*

Every man's own interpretation of the Bible is his divinely authorized creed.

Therefore, every man who, like Saul of Tarsus before his conversion, acts in harmony with his own interpretation of the Bible, will be saved.

II. *Every man who acts in harmony with the divinely authorized creed will be saved.*

The Holy Bible is our only divinely authorized creed.

Therefore, every man who acts in harmony with its precepts will be saved.

Now, gentle reader, which of these two syllogisms do you prefer? The first contains the logic of sectarianism, and the second contains the logic of Christianity.

R. MILLIGAN.

MINISTRY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.—No. III.

THE MINISTER.

"Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed?" 1 Cor. iii. 7.

Just as our attention was turned to writing this chapter, there came a circular, relating to an Annual Collection for the Birmingham Charities. The circular reads:—

"Rev. Sir,—We are directed to inform you that a General Meeting of the Clergy and Ministers of Religion, together with selected representatives of the Laity, will be held in the Committee Room of the Town Hall, on Monday, the 31st January, at half-past three precisely, to appoint a committee, &c. . . . Each Minister having the care of a church or chapel will have the privilege of giving admission to four gentlemen who are Parochial or Congregational officers, or other lay friends."

Now, had Paul come back to us upon a visit, and had this circular fallen into his hands, most certainly he would have been utterly unable to divine its meaning, until favoured with special revelation, either from heaven or from some one conversant with the ways of Babeldom. In the Church of Christ, by the Lord's appointment, there are a variety of workers, some of whom have special designations; as *Apostles, Bishops, Elders, &c.*; but none of these have the title "*Reverend*," to mark them off from some other class of workers and from the people of the Lord in general. In the New Testament we never read of the "*Rev.*" Simon Peter; nor of any other person, so distinguished.

Some object to the term *Reverend* as applied to men, because it is, as they suppose, appropriated to Jehovah himself; and they charge those who use it with applying to man a term only applicable to the Divine Being. But such persons misunderstand the nature of the case. The term is applied to God—"He sent redemption unto his people; He hath commended His covenant for ever; holy and reverend is His name. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Ps. cxi. But it is not otherwise applied to Him than is the term *holy*, in the same verse; yet Christians, individually are called "*holy*" and, collectively, a "*holy nation*." It then follows that the term "*reverend*" is not necessarily misapplied to man because applied to Jehovah. God is both *holy* and *reverend*, and His children are called to be, in these particulars, like their Father: and when they are so, they may very properly be so designated. The mistake has arisen from supposing that the term is to be appropriated exclusively to God. The same Hebrew term is applied both to things and places, and is generally translated *dreadful, fearful, or terrible*; and either of these words would have represented it in the Psalm just quoted. The Psalmist had been saying, "The works of His hands are verity and judgment;" and "*Holy and reverend* is His name" is immediately followed by the affirmation, that "the FEAR of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." In Gen. xxviii. 17 it is applied to *place*, and rendered *dreadful*. In Ex. xv. 11 it is associated with *praises*, and translated *fearful*. In Deu. i. 19 it describes a *wilderness*, and is represented by the word *terrible*.

Taking the term "*Reverend*," as applied to the clergy of our time, we have, of course to deal with it in its common signification, and then it

stands as "venerable"—"one worthy of reverence." It is not wrong to designate a person *venerable* who really is so; and it cannot be improper to apply the term *reverend* to any worthy Christian (man or woman) whose character really corresponds. But the use of the term to designate the "*clergy*," as distinguished from the "*laity*," is of the Apostacy; both *unscriptural* and *anti-scriptural*. It amounts to an exclusive application of a term which is applicable to every Christian, whose age and character correspond thereto, to a class which is solely a creation of the lawlessness, and which, as a class, is very far from manifesting special sanctity.

But returning to our circular—There are invited to the meeting the *Clergy*, the *Ministers*, and the *Laity*. Two of these classes we completely disposed of in a former article—the clergy and the laity. Pray who are the *ministers*? Surely they must be neither clergy nor laity. As such they are pretty generally treated. Of course those are intended who minister to Nonconformist Churches, as do the clergy to the State Church. Each minister having charge of a church or chapel has the liberty to introduce four lay friends. Here the terms *church* and *chapel* evidently denote buildings devoted to preaching and worship. Now, the *minister* who has charge of the chapel in which we worship never ministers in doctrine, but is a worthy shoemaker, living near at hand, who, not having too much work, increases his income by taking charge of the chapel, which he is expected to clean, open, and close, as needful. He, then, is most truly the minister in charge of the chapel. Yet we presume they will not allow him to introduce "four lay friends."

But, again—*The Minister!* *Who and what is he?* It is quite common to hear persons allude to the minister of the church to which they belong. Independents, Baptists, Presbyterians, and other Nonconformists, almost invariably use the term in the singular; as "*the minister of our church.*" We have, therefore, to ask from the New Testament an answer to the very reasonable question—What is that office in the Church of Christ which entitles the person who fills it to be termed THE MINISTER? The answer is short and simple—There is no such office; and, therefore, no such officer.

But Paul called Timothy "a minister of God," and declared Epaphras "a faithful minister of Christ." Col. i. 7. 1 Thes. iii. 2. What did he mean? Simply that they were faithful servants of God and Christ. The term *διάκονος*, in these instances rendered "*minister*," occurs in the New Testament about thirty times; and is translated *minister* twenty-one times, *servant* seven times, and *deacon* twice. Its meaning, according to the Lexicons, is—"one who serves; an attendant; a servant." It is said to mean "a deputy; a preacher; a disciple;" and so on; but it no more does so than our word *servant* means "cook, housemaid, shopman, clerk, and so forth. The word *servant* may be applied to any one whose service is rendered in the kitchen, shop, or counting-house, but it never, in itself, expresses the kind of service: it merely marks off the person as *one who serves*. So also with *diakonos*—you may know that the person so designated serves by preaching, teaching, executing a commission, but the term expresses nothing of the preaching, teaching, or commission, but only declares the actor a *servant*. Accordingly we read in Matt. xx. 26, "Who-soever will be great among you, let him be your servant (*διάκονος*); and whoever will be chief among you, let him be your slave" (*δουλος*). Here we have a very expressive distinction—Let him who would be *great* be the servant of all: but let him who would be *chief* (more than merely *great*) serve still more intently, even as a *slave* or bond-servant; for such is the

signification of *doulos*. He then who would be great in the church is not to become "*the minister*," in the sense in which the term is used by most churches, but a *servant* to his brethren in every good work. The same word is used to designate the *servants* of the king who were to bind the man who had not on a wedding garment, (Matt. xxii. 13); the *servants* at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee (John ii. 5); and it is applied to females, as in Rom xvi. 1. "Phebe our sister, who is a *servant*."

Ministry, Ministration, and Ministering, taken together and as renderings of *διακονία*, are found between *twenty and thirty* times in the New Testament. *Diaconia* first occurs in Luke x. 40—"Martha was cumbered about much serving," and there we have expressed its true signification—*serving*; the doing of any kind of service, never expressing the nature of the service. The same word is used in reference to Martha's house service, the service of Paul, the service of relieving the saints and the service of God's people as a whole. In no instance does the word itself express the nature of the service, the act of *serving* being alone expressed.

And so with *διακονέω*, which is frequently translated "*Ministered unto*." It is found in Luke xxiii. 27—"I am among you as he *that serveth*;" also in John xii. 2—"Martha *served*," and in verse 26, "If any man *serve* me, let him follow me;" and again, in Acts vi. 2—"It is not reason that we leave the word of God and *serve* tables" One and the same word, then, is used in relation to service done by Martha, by Jesus, by disciples generally, and by the table-servers in Jerusalem.

Then there is *leitourgós*, a *public servant*, occurring five times in the New Testament, and rendered *minister*. It applies to rulers; to the *higher powers* of the State; to Paul, as the *public servant* of Christ to the Gentiles; to Epaphroditus, as the *servant* or *messenger* of the Church to minister to the wants of the apostle; and to a *flame of fire*, as the servant of God. Rom. xiii. 6, xv. 16; Phil. ii. 25, Heb. i. 7. There is, therefore, nothing clerical in this word.

Clerical ministry is also imposed upon us in the New Testament by means of the word *ἐπιστάτης*. In *four* instances it is translated in the interest of the clergy—"Who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and *ministers* of the word" (Luke i. 2); "And they had also John to their *minister*." (Acts xiii. 5); "I have appeared unto thee to make thee a *minister* and witness" (Acts xxvi. 16); "Let a man so account of us as of *ministers* of Christ" (1 Cor. iv. 1). But *huperetees*, in its primary meaning, is an "*under rower*," one who sat on the rower's bench under a superior officer. In its secondary sense it denotes an *inferior officer*, chiefly of the civil courts. It also came to denote any kind of servant—official or domestic. It is translated *officer* in Mat. v. 25, and in other texts. It is rendered *servant* in Mark xiv. 54, and elsewhere. Here, too, we find no trace of clerical meaning.

It thus appears that in the New Testament *ministry* is presented to us as service of any kind, rendered by disciples of Christ to God and His Church; and that, in the common English translation, the words rendered *ministry, minister, &c.*, are occasionally weakened and perverted under the influence of clerical bias; that *minister* is never once used to denote a clerical functionary; and that there is no work or office in the Church of God set apart for one individual which entitles him to be designated *THE MINISTER*; also that there is no trace of a class of officers who are authorized specially and exclusively to designate themselves *Ministers*—in a word, that there is no more authority for one man to be regarded as the one minister of a church than there is for popes and cardinals. Not

that the word *minister* is in itself inappropriate. It is derived from the Latin *ministro*, which signifies *to serve, to wait on, &c.* If the term, in Church usage, were applied to all departments of service and to all who serve, there could be no objection to its use. Let it be deprived of its special parsonic application and brought back to its proper and original use and there will be no need to set it aside.

So far, we have been merely clearing the ground of the clerical rubbish with which it was covered. "And you have cleared it," says one. "You have swept away the priesthood, the clergy, the minister; and what have you left?" Patience, dear friend! We have very much left. Go with us carefully and we hope to show you the entire apostolic structure. Our purpose is to bring into view, ministry in the Church of Christ as ordained by the Lord and as it was when the apostles, guided by the Holy Spirit, completed the God-given order of things.

First, then, both in time and importance stand

APOSTLES.

"He called His disciples; and of them He chose twelve whom He named Apostles." Luke vi. 13.

The word *αποστολος* (apostle); from *αποσπελλω*, *to send forth, to dispatch*; signifies *one sent, a messenger, ambassador, envoy*. It is said to be equivalent to *αγγελος*, *angel, messenger*; but there is, at least, difference enough to make the one in certain instances decidedly preferable. *Apostolos* seems to take the higher range and to represent an ambassador or envoy with better grace and superior fitness than would *angelos*.

Apostolos occurs frequently in the New Testament, and is almost invariably translated *apostle*. In a few instances it is rendered *messenger*, and the result in some respects is, concealment of truth. The New Testament reveals a threefold application of the term.

1. APOSTLES OF GOD—As, Jesus and Moses. Heb. iii. 1.
2. APOSTLES OF CHRIST—As Peter, Andrew, and James. Mat. x.
3. APOSTLES OF THE CHURCHES—As, Paul, Barnabas, and Epaphroditus. Acts xiv. 14; Phil. ii. 25.

The Apostles of God received their respective commissions from Him; Apostles of the Christ received theirs solely from Him; the Apostles of Churches received theirs from those who sent them. These three classes of apostles are alike in name only. Jesus and Moses (Apostles of Jehovah) had not the same commission, nor at all similar work. The Apostles of Christ and those of Churches were not at all equal. Those sent forth by Churches only, had no part in the great distinctive features of the work committed by the Saviour to *His* Apostles.

"From among his disciples the Lord chose twelve, *whom he also named apostles*." He sent others forth on special missions, as the seventy; and thus sent they were, for the time, *apostles*. But no one can read the history without perceiving, that He appropriated this word to a college of men to whom alone a special and extraordinary commission was to be entrusted, and who should, ever after, be known as *the apostles of Christ*. They were men of God's chosen nation; their names are given in Mat. x.; *one* was unfaithful, and by transgression fell; they were educated for their mission during some three years, by Himself; near the close of His life He addressed the Father concerning them, "I have manifested Thy name to the men which Thou gavest me out of the world. Thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept Thy word. Now, they have known that all things whatsoever Thou hast given me are of Thee. For I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest me; and they

have received them and have known surely that I came out from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send me. I pray for them, I pray not for the world but for them which Thou hast given me; for they are Thine, and all mine are Thine, and Thine are mine; and I am glorified in them. And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to Thee. Holy Father, keep through Thine own name those whom Thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are. While I was with them in the world I kept them in Thy name; those that Thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost but the son of perdition, that the scripture might be fulfilled. And now I come to Thee, and these things I speak in the world, that they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves." John xvij. To this He added, "As Thou has sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." He had previously said, "he that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth Him that sent me."

The Saviour came in order to found His Church, but he ascended to Heaven and left His disciples without giving them even an outline. To His apostles its organization was committed. As His ambassadors they laid the foundation in Zion, and proceeded to build thereupon. They were evangelists, pastors, bishops, prophets, and deacons; in part, at least, by virtue of their apostleship, but they were more than all these. Under the Christ they stood forth as the Heaven-given and Spirit-directed *Legislature* of the Church of God's dear Son and of the Kingdom of Heaven (in its present manifestation). To them, as to stewards of God, the mysteries of the faith were revealed, that, as times and circumstances might require, they might make known the same, and thus they published *the faith* once for all made known to the saints. They were kept in the world, according to the Saviour's prayer, till the canon of Scripture had been completed, the Church in every particular set in order, and the legislation of the kingdom finished. In view of such a trust well might the Saviour say, "In the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel," Mat. xix.; and well may the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb appear upon the twelve foundations of the Heavenly Jerusalem. Rev. xxi.

The preparation necessary to the proper accomplishment of their stupendous work was unspeakably great. In earthly kingdoms legislation consists mainly in amending or reversing the acts of former legislators. But their legislation was to stand as long as the dispensation—never to be amended or reversed. They have no successors, and any attempt upon the part of church, conference, synod, or council, to change their enactments is an act of rebellion against the Lord. But the preparation needed was not larger than the head of the Church supplied. As the Plenipotentiaries on earth of the Lord both of heaven and earth, they were invested with all authority and power necessary to the establishment and right administration of the Kingdom of Heaven and of the Church of Christ. Hence was said, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall have been bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall have been loosed in heaven" (Mat. xvi.); and to this end *plenary inspiration* was needed and given. Not given when they were ordained, but promised before the death of the Lord and given by the Pentecostal baptism in the Holy Spirit, of which they were the subjects.

What the Spirit did for them, may, in fact, be gathered from the Saviour's teaching. To them He said—"The Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send

in my name, He shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you, . . . He shall guide you into all truth . . . and He will show you things to come." John xiv—xvi.

Thus qualified for the unerring discharge of their duties, they were not less completely equipped for the demonstration of their authority. As ambassadors carry with them the unmistakable credentials of their Sovereign, they were ever able to demonstrate their right and title as apostles of Christ. One of them wrote, "For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God!"—"Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you, in all patience, in signs and wonders and mighty deeds." Rom. xv; 2 Cor. xii. The signs of an apostle were not merely miracles, but, evidently miracles of the highest order; wonders most stupendous. Beside these there was the ministering of the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands. Many who were not apostles received the Holy Spirit and wrought miracles; but none of these could minister, or impart, the Spirit to others. This power was alone committed to them. It was *this* that Simon wanted to purchase; not the reception of the Spirit, for that was his, but the power to minister the Spirit to those upon whom he might put his hands; in a word, this peculiar gift, work, and sign of an apostle.

They were not only ambassadors from Christ but *witnesses* that He had risen from the dead. It was, therefore, needful in every instance, that the apostle should have seen the Lord. This was understood by the eleven, who, when they set themselves to ordain one to fill the place vacant by the fall of Judas, said—"Wherefore of these men, which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us . . . must one be ordained to be a *witness* with us of His resurrection." Acts i. So, too, in the case of Paul who, as an apostle was born out of due time. For this purpose the Lord appeared unto him. He received his commission from the lips of the Lord himself; and when his apostleship was denied, he appealed to that fact as proof that he was not wanting in this qualification. Where this truth is understood, there remains no ground to entertain Mormon and Irvingite claims to a restored apostleship. We are soon able to say, "we have tried those who say they are apostles, and are not, and have found them liars."

Men so commissioned and sustained may be expected to speak with authority; and at every point the apostles maintained the dignity of their office; yet, at the same time, with all the humility of the true followers of Jesus. Hear Paul—"For this cause I have sent unto you Timothy . . . who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ Jesus, as I teach everywhere, in every church. Now some are puffed up . . . what will ye? Shall I come unto you with a rod, or in love and in the spirit of meekness." "And so ordain I in all the churches." "Now I praise you brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances as I delivered them to you."—"The rest will I set in order when I come."—"If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord."—"Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye."—"Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle." 1 Cor. iv. 17, vii. 17, xi. 2, 16,

37, xvi. 1, 2; 2 Thes. ii. 15. No man now should dare to address a church thus. Paul *commanded*; we may but *recommend*. His word was one of authority, and His *I*, as an apostle of the Lord, was final; we can but quote the law as given by the Lord or His ambassadors. We have still the apostles to regulate the church, as the Jews had Moses in the days of the Saviour. They being dead yet speak in their records, which were written to perpetuate their commands. "This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you; in which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance; that ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the **COMMANDMENTS OF US, THE APOSTLES OF THE LORD AND SAVIOUR.**" 2 Peter iii. "He, therefore that **DESPISETH**, despiseth not **MAN**, but **GOD**, who hath also given unto us his Holy Spirit." 1 Thes. iv. 8. D. K.

CHRIST AT A MARRIAGE.

"**THERE** was a marriage in Cana of Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there: and both Jesus was called and his disciples to the marriage."—John ii. 1, 2.

Christ at a marriage—one of a wedding party—a guest at a marriage feast,—that surely is a fact worth reflecting upon. Jesus the Son of God and Son of Man; Jesus the divinely-anointed Saviour of the world; Jesus the man of sorrows, and the acquainted with grief—got an invitation to a marriage, and, without scruple or hesitancy, accepted the invitation. Surely there is some grand meaning in that fact. Surely there is something of no trivial importance to be learned from it. The Evangelist does not tell us who the bride and bridegroom were. He says next to nothing about either of them. Their names even are not mentioned. We are left to conjecture that, in all probability, they were the intimate friends or acquaintances of Mary the mother of Jesus. She was there apparently not so much by invitation as by right. She seems to have taken upon herself the duty of looking after the comfort of the guests,—of contributing by her kind attentions to the pleasure of the wedding party. The bride and bridegroom are not made prominent in the narrative, doubtless because it was the intention of the Evangelist to fix our minds on the presence, word and deed, of the Saviour himself. We can well afford to remain in ignorance of the names of the happy couple who invited Jesus to their marriage. Enough for us to know that they did invite Him and His disciples with Him; that He accepted the invitation, and that on that happy occasion He wrought His first miracle, and manifested forth His glory.

Our subject leads us naturally to consider:—

1. *Christ's relation to the marriage institution.* The institution of marriage is not of recent origin, but is co-eval with the existence of the human race. The foundation on which it rests is, on the one hand, the nature of man, and, on the other, the will of God. "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." And the Creator having brought into being a creature of such a nature, adapted His treatment of him to the nature He had given him. Hence, we are told that "the Lord God said, It is not good that man should be alone: I will make him an help-meet for him." So, in Eden—fair and sinless Eden—was the marriage institution inaugurated by God himself. Man fell, but this institution fell not with him. It was destined to survive the wreck of the fall, and to prove an unspeakable boon to man in his fallen state. It is a remnant of man's primeval state of innocence and bliss. It is a flower that blooms in the desert of this world's misery, and sheds its

sweetest fragrance on all who do not ruthlessly pluck it by the roots, or crush it beneath their feet.

But, alas! this divinely-inaugurated institution has been greatly abused. Its beauty has been oftentimes sadly marred in the course of the world's history. The vile systems of concubinage, polygamy, and communism have defaced its fair features, and covered it as with the sable wing of an angel of death. The foul demon of lust has looked upon it with an envious eye, and sought to lay its honour in the dust. So deep is the depravity of the human heart, so desperate its wickedness, so lawless its passions, that men have, in various ways, attempted to ride rough-shod over this sweet, fragrant flower of Eden.

How, then, did Christ regard this marriage institution? Did He smile or frown upon it? Reverence or disparage it? Unquestionably the former. Very significant is the fact that His first public appearance after his return to Galilee from the banks of Jordan, was at a marriage festival. In the Church of England marriage service, Christ is said to have "adorned and beautified the holy estate of matrimony with His presence and first miracle that He wrought in Cana of Galilee." Who can doubt it? All lovers of social order, of domestic purity and peace have reason to be devoutly thankful for the fact that Christ honoured with His holy, divine presence a marriage company. "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh."

II. *Christ's relation to our festive joys.* A marriage is generally, is expected always to be, a joyous event. It is a little festive season to those who are present at the celebration of the nuptials. The heart is light and gay, the countenance is wreathed with smiles, mirth and joy abound. Dull care, gloomy grief, and pale-faced melancholy are banished far away. The marriage at Cana does not seem to have been any exception to the general rule. We have no reason to believe that that wedding party was less joyous and mirthful than such parties usually were or are. The presence of Jesus, while it might act as a restraint upon boisterous unhallowed mirth, certainly did not act as a barrier in the way of any innocent pleasure, any rational amusement. We cannot suppose that the presence of Jesus made the company less glad and happy than otherwise they would have been. So far from detracting from their festive joys, His presence enhanced them. Christ did not go to that marriage-feast as an enemy to human joys, to frown upon innocent pleasures. His attitude was as far as possible from being that of the indifferent stoic, the sneering cynic, the gloomy ascetic, or the haughty contemptuous Pharisee. He went to diffuse a richer joy, to cause a brighter gladness to radiate all around Him, to make happy hearts still more happy, to hallow the relationships of social and domestic life. When the party broke up, would not all feel glad that Jesus had formed one of their number? We think they would, and from this we learn Christ's relation to our festive joys. It is one of friendliness. He frowns on no innocent enjoyments, prohibits no harmless amusements, proscribes no hallowed mirth at its proper time, in its proper place and degree. On the contrary He claims to be as has been truly said, "The giver of all joy, the redeemer of all joy, even in its earthliest forms, from that which makes it base and inhuman." How comes it then that we are so prone to exclude Jesus, the great joy-bringer, from our thoughts at our festive seasons? Why is it that we are so disposed to turn to Him in our sorrows, and neglect Him in our joys? On what principle is it that we shut Him out from our marriages and welcome Him to our funerals? Is it doing fairly by Him to call Him in as we do the undertaker, only when some loved

one has been laid low by the hand of death? Should we treat any human friend thus? If not, why should we wait till some sore calamity befall us, or some huge sorrow be like to overwhelm us, before we invite Jesus to our hearts and homes? If young men and maidens were to follow the example of the bride and bridegroom at Cana and invite Jesus by prayer to their marriage, how much happier would be their union, how much sweeter their conjugal fellowship, how much purer their domestic joys, how much nobler their lives, how much more peaceful and triumphant their deaths!

III. *Christ's relation to the drinking customs of society.* Not a few of the supporters of these customs make merry over the marriage at Cana. They think they give total abstainers a hard nut to crack when they refer to the miracle of turning the water into wine at a marriage feast. The only lesson they seem to have learned from the sacred story is, that if they would be friendly and sociable, they must keep to their moderate drinking practices. But what if it turn out that such a lesson is rather put into, than drawn legitimately from, the Evangelist's narrative? No one, of course, can appeal to the marriage at Cana in justification of his conduct as a moderate drinker, without assuming that the wine which our Lord miraculously made was just such wine as is in common use in Britain at the present day—alcoholic intoxicating wine. But is not this rather a large assumption to make? If it were the case that the "good wine" for which the wedding guests were indebted to Jesus was—like the pure juice of the choicest grapes—as harmless in its nature, and as a beverage, far more pleasant and refreshing than the "cup which cheers but not inebriates," it were absurd to come to this source for a plea to justify even the moderate use of such intoxicants as our publicans retail. It is our firm conviction that such was in reality the innocent nature of the wine furnished by our Lord.

The vine is one of the choicest plants which God has caused to grow on the earth. The fruit of the vine—the pure blood of the grape (see Deut. xxxii. 14), is one of the richest and best of the good creatures which God hath created, to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." As such it is in passages too numerous for quotation associated with other material blessings that are indispensable to human existence and comfort. Such phrases as "corn and wine," "corn, and wine and oil," &c., are frequently to be met with in the Old Testament Scriptures, "He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the use of man, that he may bring forth food out of the earth; and *wine that maketh glad the heart of man*, and oil to make his face to shine, and bread that strengtheneth man's heart. Ps. civ. 14, 15. The authors of "The Temperance Bible Commentary" sum up their notes on this passage with the remark that, "The Psalmist beyond all controversy regarded the wine to which he had alluded as a creature of God, the natural uncorrupted product of His power, and to such wine the eulogy pronounced upon it in this verse must be absolutely restricted." The vine in Jotham's parable (Judges ix. 13.) is represented as saying, "Should I leave my wine which cheereth God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees?" Such wine as is referred to in these texts was both "food for the healthy and medicine to the sick," and is spoken of in the Scriptures in commendatory terms.

We are aware, however, that there are other passages in which wine is spoken of in condemnatory language—denounced as a mocker and a deceiver, declared at the last to bite like a serpent and sting like an adder. (See Proverbs, xx. 1., and xxiii. 32.) Such wine we are warned not to look upon. Such wine defileth them that use it, causeth them to err, bringeth

upon them the just judgment of God. (Compare Daniel i. 8., and Isaiah xxviii.) Could it possibly be such wine that was called into existence by the miracle-working power of the Saviour? Who could bear such a conjunction of terms as,—Draw out now and bear unto the governor of the feast, for wine not only defiles and causes to err, but it is a mocker and a deceiver, yea, more, at last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder?

That this wedding party was already partially intoxicated by the wine of the bridegroom, and that our Lord miraculously produced a further supply of similar alcoholic wine is a supposition so repugnant and detestable that we envy not the man who can unblushingly make it. That the Saviour of the world could turn water into alcoholic wine by means of which drunkards are manufactured, and at the same time manifest forth His glory and elicit His disciples' faith, is to our minds, not only a manifest absurdity, but a sheer impossibility. We reject with abhorrence the idea that the blessed Jesus wrought a miracle, the natural result of which would be to foster intoxication among the wedding guests. Away with such a thought.

But whatever may be the truth on the subject of the wines of the Scripture, one thing seems as clear as noon-day, viz., that the attitude of our Saviour in reference to the drinking customs of modern society, must be one of uncompromising opposition. Are not these drinking customs the prolific source of untold degradation, wretchedness and ruin? Are they not inimical in the highest degree to the spiritual and eternal welfare of those who freely lend their countenance to them? Is not the drink traffic of our country the fruitful parent of such a horrid progeny as disease, pauperism, lunacy, crime, and premature death? Is it not clogging the wheels of the nation's industry, draining the resources of its commerce, and sapping the foundations of its strength and morality? Is not its history a roll wherein are written in tears and blood "lamentations, mourning, and woe" to an extent that might even move the fiends in hell? Does it not form one of the mightiest barriers to the spread of the gospel of peace that the ingenuity of Satan himself could devise?

If there is any truth at all in these suppositions, if Jesus were visibly on the earth now, would His attitude be one of indifference or of unswerving hostility to this unmitigated evil, this accursed drink-system? Could He walk through our streets and see and hear what our eyes see and our ears hear almost daily, without being moved with compassion for the miserable, degraded victims of intemperance on the one hand, and without pronouncing on the other hand some of His terrific woes upon the men who, for filthy lucre's sake, have their hands full of the blood of lost and ruined souls? And were He to be invited to a marriage, is it conceivable that He would give His sanction to the imbibing of intoxicating drink, not to say work a miracle to increase the quantity of such a pernicious beverage? The thought, must be abhorrent to every right-thinking mind. Far from us at least be such thought of Him "who took our nature and our place," "*who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.*"

Christian News.

J. F.

BREVITIES.

"You cannot expect too much from God or too little from men."

"Men judge our hearts by our words and works. God judges our words and works by our hearts."

"A man should not praise his works, but his works should praise him."

"No evil action can be well done, but a good one may be ill done."

WORDS FROM THE WORK TABLE.—No. XXX.

WOMAN'S INFLUENCE.

"I entreat thee also, true yokefellow, help those women which laboured with me in the gospel."

"I commend unto you Phœbe, our sister, which is a servant in the Church."—PAUL.

"WHAT influence have I?"—is a common expression. I need hardly say to the reader, that even from the ragged urchin, homeless and friendless, flows an influence moulding and maturing other minds. It is true in regard to all that each acts and re-acts upon the other. We know that the *future* depends upon the *present*; that "the individual in relation to the multitude of human influences that act upon him, is as a spring to many raindrops, but, in relation to another individual mind, as a raindrop to a spring. What an infinite number of the thoughts and acts of other persons must there have been, for our life to be, in fulness and quality, what it is; and we ourselves as members of that great social company, by what we do and think, form part of that great rain of influence by which other springs are flowing or shall rise. Every man is both a son of the race and a father of posterity. His life is born of the general life of the world, and the good or evil of the world that shall be, must in part take origin of him." May we all be impressed with the thought, that even the *lowest* in the social scale *can* and *does* originate, or swell, a stream of influence which will continue flowing through the everlasting future.

Woman, too, has her full share in moulding the destinies of the world. How needful then for her to consider the extent of her consequent responsibility and to prepare herself for the mission she is created to fulfil. Bad as things are in this world of sin and death, there is a wide spread expectation of "a good time coming." This hope is good if we only use right means to hasten it. Of this I am satisfied—that no scheme for its realisation will ever bring it in unless the Bible and Woman have their proper place. In thus speaking, I am not supported merely by effeminate and crotchety men. Earl Russell, in an inaugural address to one of the gatherings of the friends of social science, said—"Every one must have observed the new influence which is not being asserted or sought, but is falling to the lot of woman in swaying the destinies of the world. It is not a share in directing the patronage of ministers, or guiding the councils of kings, as in former times, but a portion in the formation and moulding of public opinion. . . . It seems to me, and I am confirmed in this opinion by the bright examples of heroic benevolence we have seen of late years, that if the young generation are to be an improvement upon their fathers—if sin is to have less dominion and religion more power—if vice is to be abashed, and virtue to be honoured, it is to woman we must look for such regeneration."

Elihu Burritt also gives high rank to woman's influence. He says—"If, as we are assured, scores of new stars have taken rank with the heavenly hosts during the last two centuries, stars brighter than they, have, in the same period, kindled up new lights in the moral firmament. Among these new stars one, a little lower than that of Bethlehem, has just arisen above the horizon. It is the star of woman's influence! Influential woman is a being of scarcely two centuries; up to that period, and almost hitherto, her influences have fallen upon human character and society, like the feeble rays of a rising winter's sun upon polar fields of ice. But her sun is reaching upward. There is a glorious meridian to which *she* shall come as surely as to-morrow's sun shall reach his in our natural heavens. What man shall be when she shall smile on him then and thence, we are unable to say; but we can find no anticipation from

the influence of her dawning rays. Her morning light has gilded the visions of human hope and silvered over the night-shadows of human sorrows. . . . Whether we trace the lineaments of her character in the mild twilight of her morning sun, or in the living beams of her risen day, we find that she has touched human society like an angel. It would be irreverent to her worth to say, in what walks of life she has walked most like an angel of light and love, in what vicissitudes, in what joys or sorrows, in what situations or circumstances, she has most signally discharged the heavenly ministrations of her mission; what ordeals have best brought out the radiance of her hidden jewels, what fruitions of earthly bliss, or furnaces of affliction have best declared the fineness of her gold. There has been no depth of human misery beyond the reach of her ameliorating influence, nor any height of human happiness which she has not raised still higher."

Alexander Campbell ascribes to woman equal if not loftier power—"Woman is to society what the spirit is to the body; for, as the body without the spirit is dead, society without woman is dead also. She is the quickening, animating, conservative element of society. If man on this terraqueous ball be the glory of God, most certainly woman is the glory of man. She is the life, the beauty, the ornament, the glory of society. What a simple, powerful, and sublime preface has God written to the volume of her history—"It is not good," said He, "that man should be alone:" and at once *by his side* stood—woman! never was a being more appropriately named. She is called *Eve*, which in our own language is equivalent to *life*, because she is the fountain and source of society."

We have then the acknowledgment of the great, the learned, and the good to the importance and extent of woman's influence. To speak of woman as being necessarily such a messenger of good, is simply absurd—to say that she frequently is so, is only the truth—to admit that she is frequently more the fiend than the angel candour demands. Her true standing must be estimated by contrasting her duties and influence, with her fitness to discharge the one and her power of rendering the other great and permanent. Did space permit, I might glance at woman as daughter, sister, betrothed, wife, mother, widow, mistress, and servant, and contrast the influence which is now prevalent with that which would be exercised were she, generally, morally and socially fitted for the correct performance of the all-important duties devolving upon her.

As a *mother*, woman's power is paramount; the whole world being in her arms—her worth in this direction was well expressed, when in reply to Napoleon's question—"What is needful to make France a great nation?" he received for answer—"Mothers"! To them is entrusted the moulding of the plastic clay of humanity, during those early years which the Jesuits deem so important—they say—leave the children to our care till they are seven and then we fear no Protestant teaching afterwards, the seeds of true Catholicism will be too deeply sown.

As *sister*, she either softens, subdues, and polishes the manners of her brothers; or she excites them to bold adventures in the ways of false pride, false shame, false honor.

As *wife*, nature has assigned her the home for her empire. The labourer who toils from break of day till the shades of evening have veiled the face of nature; the merchant who leaves the family dwelling to rack his brain with business calculation, during eight or ten hours daily, have little or no share in home management, and wives in most instances, largely contribute to make these men what they are. If, while the husband toils for wife and children, through summer's heat and winter's piercing cold,

through every variation of our changing clime—they regulate for him, and to him, next their God, make all things minister, is it likely that he'll neglect that home, to wile away his little resting time where drunkards congregates, where vice appals, and where folly ends in crime?

But my readers, I presume, are chiefly Christian women, and all such have professed to see that the Author of life and salvation demands from them an unselfish life, and have covenanted, in the spirit of their Master, so to live, love, and serve Him. And all such know, or should know, that they cannot love and serve Him without their influence is purifying and elevating society. Look around on this land of Bibles and religious liberty, and what do you behold? Darkness—gross darkness! The light of the glorious gospel of God's favor does not shine forth in its splendour, the character of the living God is unknown to thousands—with churches and chapels crowding our thoroughfares the masses are still without spiritual food. Here is a noble field for the Christian woman! She feels and values the love of Christ; she longs to extend the knowledge thereof to those around; all her desires for refinement, peace and sobriety are merged in one; she longs for the pure bright light of the Star of Bethlehem, and in this she stands man's equal—she can labour side by side with him in spreading the glorious truths of the gospel—like him she stands a priest to God, to offer the sacrifices of prayer and praise and the service of a willing loving heart, Christian women, on what a proud and lofty pinnacle you stand! See to it that ye stand fast: your's is a mighty responsibility—you are placed as lights upon a hill-top, epistles to be known and read of all. Your every action should proclaim to those around, your privileged position. It may not be your's to sound forth from platform or from pulpit the glorious news of the gospel, but your dress, your homes, your conversation, should all proclaim whose disciples you are. Drink deep into the spirit of Christ, and the sweet and gentle influence of your loving deeds and words will bless society around you and preach Christ more efficiently than a hundred clergymen who preach only by words. Love for God and His Word is a purifying, elevating principle; possessing this, we possess the lever to raise the world. Are your desires for human progress, the world's weal, and man's salvation? If so, then feed those desires with the oil of love, and be as you should be, ministers in the great work of man's reconciliation to God—instruments to his true elevation, and promoters of his present and eternal happiness. Of late years we have heard and read much of "Woman's Rights," and a sharp contest is being fought in some quarters. Her rights are many—various and valuable, and we do well to see that she is in possession of them. Let us remember that among woman's most prominent rights, are—

"The Right to labour and to pray;
The Right to watch when others sleep,
The Right o'er others woes to weep;
The Right to love whom others scorn,
The Right to comfort all who mourn;
The Right to shed new joys on earth,
The Right to feel the soul's high worth;
The Right to lead on souls to God,
Along the path the Saviour trod;
The path of meekness and of love,
The path of faith that leads above;
The path of patience under wrong,
The path in which the weak grow strong;—
Such Woman's Rights our God will bless,
And crown their champion with success."

Birmingham.

LOUISE.

GETHESEMANE.

THE ambitious spirit delights to pause and linger around scenes and records of achievements which have added to the pyramid of fame. Many spots, o'er wave and vale and hill, are only cherished in memory because of the deeds of wonder or of daring they have witnessed. It only needs the words, "For freedom," to be sounded in the ears of a soldier on the battlefield to inspire him with the spirit of heroism. Such scenes and words act like a charm in nerving the energy and stirring the heart. So, too, with the soldier of the Cross! The Christian warrior hath his scenes and places of glorious fame. Animated by a holier love, he beholds spots sacred and dear to him because of the feet that trod them and on account of the hearts that poured out their life's blood for what they held dearer than life itself.

There stands Jerusalem! Noble, grand Jerusalem—heaven-favoured city; where deeds of love and mercy have been so profusely given. There stands her Benefactor, with head bowed and face bathed in tears, as He speaks of the desolation to come. Yonder is Bethlehem; where the angel shouted for joy and sang of "peace toward men." And there stands Bethany—blessed Bethany! sacred for thy ministering love to the weary traveller from day to day and for the record of that divine sympathy with human sorrow—groaning in spirit, "JESUS WEPT." But mourning souls, dry up your tears; for hark the solemn but joyful words, "Lazarus come forth!" The eye rests, too, upon the waters that were calmed by the same voice and which nearly overwhelmed a wavering Peter.

But let us leave all these and retire to an, as yet, unmentioned spot. Bordering on Mount Olivet, shrouded in vines and olives, stands the ever-memorial garden of Gethsemane; and as we gaze on that scene of sorrow and suffering, with heart hushed with wonder and eyes in tears, let us ask, why it was? Yea, "surely He hath carried our griefs and borne our sorrows!" Think you, gentle reader, of that night, when He, the Son of God, yet man—who was rich, yet poor—left the city for that sacred spot where He had so often communed with His Father. There He kneels! Well might the moon cease to give her rays of peacefulness, and well might the heavenly host, if ever called to weep, shed tears over such sorrow as this! Behold the meek and lowly one, borne down by the torrent of guilt (not His own), prostrated on the ground, and hear the words—"Let this cup pass from me." O, will the Saviour falter at the last? No! The flesh is weak but the spirit is willing. Then hear His saving word, "Thy will be done." Blessed garden! Sad Gethsemane! Sacred ground! Scene of sorrow, of love, of infinite condescension! Let thy ground be ever sacred to my memory, ever joy for my sorrow, ever animation for my love; and as drops of blood fell from Thee, thou Lamb of God, may tears of love and gratitude flow from my eyes in proof of appreciation of that blood which flowed to set me free; then, if I have sorrows to meet, sufferings to endure, trials to overcome, oh, blessed Jesus! may I imitate Thy example, and in the midst of all exclaim, "Not My will, O Father, but Thine be done." T. H. F.

"MAN, in a state of alienation and rebellion, suspects that if God hate sin, He must hate him!—as love begets love, so hatred begets hatred. And if a man suspects that God hates him, he cannot love God. He must know that God loves him before he can begin to love God." 1 John iv. 19.

Reviews, Notes, Passing Events, &c.

COMMUNION—THE DIFFERENCE.*

THE *British Harbinger*, published in London, England, copies our remarks, under the heading, "The Difference," in which we attempted to explain the difference between the Editor and some American brethren. He adds the foregoing remarks. We take pleasure in inserting them on several accounts.

I. It is good for him to explain for himself.

II. He has a clear mind, always able to discriminate differences and state them plainly.

III. He has the calmness, coolness and kindness to notice points of difference without excitement or irritation, and without treating those from whom he differs contemptuously.

1. Among the vast number of brethren in this country, scattered as they are over thousands of miles of territory, there are many thousands who never saw the letters of Br. King, as they have appeared in no paper but the *Review*. Many others have seen them, but read them with no care, and consequently have no conception of the main points in them. These several classes have heard others speak of the matter without any clear explanation of the difference, and inquire what it is.

2. The brethren who have written touching the matter, in response to Br. King, in this country, did not aim, if we understand the matter, especially Br. Smith, to state the main view or practice of the brethren, on this side of the Atlantic, but *their own view*. We were thinking of the *general view* and practice, and not their *individual view*.

3. Our remarks about "open and close communion," we see, were liable to misconstruction on the part of Br. King. We were not thinking of any use he had made of these words, but making explanations to avoid misunderstanding here, as there had been a controversy involving these terms, as also in view of the Baptist use of these terms. We knew that Br. King had no use for the Baptist idea and was advocating nothing of the kind; and were guarding against any who might have but a limited acquaintance with the subject thinking that he was aiming at Baptist close communion. He means *close* Christian communion, or the communion of Christians, or the disciples of Christ, without anybody else communing with them. We mean that, too. It is the Lord's table, and for the Lord's people. It is for nobody else. It is in the body of Christ, and for no one not in the body. It is not a *converting* institution to give to the people of the world as a means of grace to bring them to Christ, but an important part of the worship for those in *Christ*.

4. When we prepare the emblems, open the way for those not in Christ, in any way encourage them to commune, and hand them the emblems, we take the responsibility. We *encourage* them to partake, and intentionally *administer it to them*. We cannot, with any Scripture authority or reason, administer the communion, or any other ordinance, to any person, in the name of the Lord, whom we know not to be a proper subject. No person is a proper

* Will the reader please turn to the *B. H.* of November last and read our remarks upon an article from B. Franklin, Editor of the *American Christian Review*, headed "The Difference"? Those remarks have been copied into the *Review*, followed by the article here reprinted. B. Franklin has so completely comprehended the motive which led us to pen that series of letters, and so exactly expressed our conviction as to our *right* to publish them and the expediency of doing so, that we need not add another word. His acquaintance with the Brethren in America is as large as that of any man living, and his paper, in circulation, is far ahead of any other. Ed.

subject for the communion who has not been immersed into Christ. To administer the communion to any one not in Christ, is manifestly to administer it to one who is not a proper subject. This is as absurd as to administer immersion to one who is not a proper subject. We should do neither, knowingly. It is not enjoined on us to know the heart in either case, nor to judge the heart. But if we know a person has no faith, as in the case of an infant, we know such a one is not a scriptural subject for immersion. Or if a man should avow that he has no faith, or no repentance, at the very time when he should confess Christ, we know he is not a proper subject for immersion, and no well-instructed man would administer to him the initiatory rite. In administering sacred rites, we should unquestionably administer to none known not to be proper subjects. We have a responsibility in administering as certainly as the recipient has in partaking. This is the point to which Br. King aimed more particularly to call attention. This calling attention to it has unquestionably done good. It has caused much to be said about it, and the matter has been more carefully considered by many, who are making it a matter of interest to be as near as possible in all things, like those living and practising the apostles' teaching under their own eyes. Many careless and irregular habits have been corrected, and much better order in many instances has been introduced. Much more attention will yet be given to the subject, and we are thankful that he wrote.

5. Some of our more refined and polite brethren have questioned the modesty, courtesy and the urbanity of Br. King, in attempting to criticise our practice, or in anywise call it in question, seeing he is located beyond the great water. But these great matters are not mere matters of *etiquette*, nor to be turned into mere questions of *courtesy*. We must not

permit our minds to be turned away from considering the true worship and order in the house of God, by allusions calculated to excite national feeling and prejudice. The kingdom of God is the same on both sides of the Atlantic. The true worship is the same, and the law of God. The will of God is the same. The family of God is the same throughout the world, and the rights of the children of God are the same, to speak of their family affairs, anywhere in the entire kingdom. Can we not bear to be criticised by a worthy brother with a clear head and a Christian heart, who writes in a kind spirit and in a respectful style, because he is located beyond the Atlantic? Surely we can; especially one of many years' standing, the editor of an able publication in London (the *British Harbinger*). We desire to worship according to the Scriptures, or, which is the same, according to the will of God. We love to read after any man who will try to "teach us the way of the Lord more perfectly." As a people, we have, in time past, given much attention to the way into the Kingdom, or the manner of turning to God—becoming Christians; but no more than was demanded. Nor can we give any less attention to this department in time to come. But more attention is now needed, not only to be devoted to the morals of the disciples of the Lord, the character of Christians, the officering and discipline of the church, but to the *worship itself*, in the house of the Lord. We need investigation on the following points:

1. Who are the proper subjects for worship in the Church?
2. Of what does the true worship consist?
3. What is the proper manner of conducting the true worship?

Close attention to these subjects for the next five years would do a vast amount of good. Inattention to these subjects leads to a vast amount of disorder and irregularity. Aside from a few among us not very

thorough, and a little in *advance* of the New Covenant, behind it, or aside from it, we are pretty much one, on both sides of the Atlantic, and shall, by the blessing of Heaven, remain one. It is good for us to exchange views and see whether we have learned Christ alike, and belong to the same school. Br. King's letters have *generally* been well received in this country. Had they been *universally* well received, it would have been more than is true

of anything we produce here. Let us all study to see who can walk the most nearly to the Saviour. We shall soon be where the Atlantic and the lines of civil governments will not separate us, and where we shall never separate any more. The Lord himself, in person, will then be with us, and go before us. If we are true to Him now, our mistakes will all then be ended for ever. "What will it be to be there!"

REVISION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

DURING the last month the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury has busied itself with the question of Bible Revision, and nearly the whole of the Episcopal Bench seem to feel the need of conforming the Authorized Version more strictly to the original. This feeling has taken effect in the appointment of a committee, which may be expected to report at a subsequent session of the Convocation. The Bishop of St. David's was impressed with the difficulty and danger of letting the people have God's revelation without the errors of the Common Version. The Earl of Shaftesbury, too, immediately rushes into print to avert, if possible, the dire calamity; and this he does as the president of the *Bible Society*. But the simple truth is, that the Bishop and the Earl are afraid of the Bible. As many of our readers may not have seen the Earl's letter, and as it may be desirable to preserve it for subsequent reference, it may be well to reproduce it:—

Sir,—as President of the Bible Society, I request leave to address you, and through you the public, on "the revision of the version of the Scriptures, as proposed by the Upper House of Convocation," at their sitting on the 11th of this month.

If the suggested revision were intended to remove serious mistranslations involving errors of faith and doctrine, we should, such error being admitted, have nothing to say. But we have the remark of the Bishop of St. David's, made at this same sitting, who "did not believe that any

alteration in the verbal or grammatical construction of the New Testament would in any way affect the doctrine which the Church of England now held." At this point their Lordships, "contrary," as your reporter observes, "to their usual custom, broke out into cries of 'Hear hear,' 'Hear hear!'" thus giving to the sufficiency of our version the testimony of nearly the whole of the Episcopal Bench.

His Lordship of St. David's proceeded to observe "that the issue of this movement might be a Church Bible and a Dissenting Bible; and this would be such a tremendous evil that no advantage which could possibly be gained could ever compensate for it."

This statement, though most true, is very greatly under the mark. The English Bible, as altered by the Bishops, will cease to be the Bible, not only of the Nonconformists, but of the Scotch and Irish Presbyterian Churches; it would cease to be the Bible of our brethren in the United States of America, and of every Protestant speaking the English language over the entire surface in the globe; we should, moreover, lie under the burden, the importance of which will, of course, be variously estimated, of having the fifty millions copies of the Scriptures already issued by the Society "synodically condemned." Such is the phrase by the two Houses of Convocation.

It would be difficult to describe the benefits that have been derived by a very large portion of the human race from this hearty, earnest, and general acceptance of the authorised version; but it would be still more difficult to describe the manifold evils that would flow from a disruption of it.

Nearly all, I believe, both of Churchmen and Dissenters, would be most happy to leave the translation as it at present exists, and to forbear the assertion of their own special criticisms on words and phrases; but if the Bishops will insist on such

minute accuracy, others will be equally positive in similar demands. Many will ask, and justly ask, whether "the Church," as understood in the present day, is a due rendering of the Greek; and why it should be "Church" in one place, and "Assembly" in another.

They will also ask how far the word now rendered by "Bishop," designates a Bishop of the present day; and, turning to the word "Priest," they will, since all possibility of mistake is to be avoided, require such a marginal note, at least, as shall remove the confusion that now prevails between the priests of the Old Testament, and the priests of the New.

This is effected in the French Protestant translations by the use of "Sacrificateur"—a word which could never be used in our Prayer-book, or applied to designate a Protestant minister.

In the sincere hope that the public voice and opinion of all English-speaking Protestants may avert this calamity,

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
February 12. SHAFTESBURY.

The foregoing letter is a singular compound; defiant, alike, both of truth and logic. If the revision were intended to remove serious errors of faith and doctrine, the noble Earl would not oppose; but as it would not affect the doctrine which the Church of England now holds, he has the strongest possible objection. Thus he objects because so little would be changed. But, then, he immediately points out the appalling consequences which are to result if the proposed evil be not prevented—one Bible for the Church and another for the Nonconformists—the Church of England Bible would not be that of the Irish Church nor of the Churches of America and the Colonies. But what if it were not? It would be a *better* Bible, and the State Church would, at least, possess one priceless advantage—that of having more of the revealed truth of God open to all its members than many other Churches. No very injurious thing, that! But this result need not exist. Leave the clergy at liberty in the Church Service to use either the old or the new version, or both—that is, give them the same liberty which Non-

conformists would possess, and then the new will gradually take the place of the old, both in the chapels and the churches, so called; and then, too, Bible reading will receive an impetus, by the comparison, which will teach the people more in a year than otherwise they would learn in seven times as long.

The *Leeds Mercury* has a worthy leading article upon the subject, which reads—

The bishops are at length opening their eyes to the fact that a proper reverence for God's Word demands, not a superstitious adherence to translation confessedly imperfect, but an effort to place it before the public in a form calculated to convey, with the utmost attainable accuracy, the true mind of its Divine Author. Now whatever else we have got in our present authorised version—and nobody is more keenly alive to its merits than ourselves—we have certainly not got a faultless translation of the original. Whatever else scholars differ about, they agree about two things, that the authorised Greek text of the New Testament is defective in itself, and that the authorised English translation is an imperfect rendering even of that defective text. No doubt, if one were to set about altering, there would be many points on which competent critics would differ; but, on the other hand, there are at least a large number of alterations, both of the Greek and of the English, on which there is, among the ablest judges, no diversity of opinion; and with the full knowledge of this, it appears to us highly injurious, and dishonouring to the truth—to say nothing of its Author—to be publishing year after year a confessedly imperfect rendering of the revealed mind of God.

There are several objections urged. It is said, for example, that people have got so attached to the words of the present translation that it would seriously wound their feelings to give it up. If people are more attached to the words of the human translator than to the meaning of the Divine Author, the sooner their feelings are shocked the better. Where there is real reverence for Scripture as the revealed mind of God, every alteration which conveys that mind more distinctly and fully will be welcomed. It is for such persons that the Scripture is given, not for those who value a pet phrase more than the truth which that pet phrase conceals or distorts. Again, it is urged that the great truths of Scripture are plainly enough taught in our present translation, and that it is only on minute unimportant points that a revision would

really throw any light. With certain reservations, we cheerfully concede the former half of this statement, but we must altogether demur to treating any part of God's Word as unimportant. That there are degrees of importance we admit, though we question whether we are the proper judges of what these degrees are. We believe the Author of the book has marked them Himself, and that the relative importance of the different subjects dealt with in the Scriptures are only to be learnt from the Scriptures. But the simple answer is that if the Bible is God's Word, and if God has thought a truth important enough for Him to give, we have no right to say that it is not important enough for us to receive. If it was good for Him to give, it must be good for us to take; and if so, it surely is good to take the truth He gives instead of a counterfeit, conveyed in the shape of an incorrect translation. We pass over such arguments as those urged some years ago by Sir Geo. Grey, who, when the subject was raised in the House of Commons, urged that clergymen and ministers might explain any inaccuracies to their flocks when they read the Scriptures in church or chapel! As if no persons read the Scriptures except on Sunday morning or evening! And as if the same argument might not just as well be urged in favour of using the Latin Vulgate or any other translation which should make ignorant people dependent on the priest for

its understanding! The arguments to our minds appear to be irresistible in favour of a revised translation.

Why we should look to the State Church, to Convocation, or to the Government, for a translation of the Scriptures may be difficult to say. Let a convocation of scholars, without regard to denomination—embracing Romanists and Protestants, Churchmen, and Nonconformists, Christians and Jews, be convened to do the work, as *scholars* and *not* as *sectarians*; and let the churches and the public supply the money, which will be cheerfully done, if only the organization is called into existence under circumstances that indicate the thoroughness of the undertaking. This we would have done, and we believe it will be done. Still, while there is a Book looked to as an Authorized Version, it is incumbent upon parties concerned, very speedily, to see that it be brought into much greater conformity to the original than at present.

D. K.

ALBERT BARNES ON CREEDS.

A MAN sometimes finds himself in a position in which it is necessary for him to tell the truth fully or to retire from his position.

A few years ago Mr. Zebulon Styles Ely, of New York, gave ten thousand dollars to the Union Theological Seminary of the city of New York to found a lectureship devoted to the Evidences of Christianity. He provided that the course should comprise ten public lectures, and be delivered by different lecturers once in two or three years. Rev. Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia, the well-known author of Notes on the New Testament, was elected to deliver the first course in January and February of 1867. These ten lectures published, make a very valuable volume of more than four hundred pages. In the tenth lecture it became necessary for him

in the course of his argument, to assert the absolute fixedness and unchangeableness of Christianity; and this again made it necessary for him to repudiate all those changeable and contradictory systems, bequeathed to the world by synods and councils, which sometimes usurp the place of Christianity. If he had failed to repudiate these, his argument would have been worthless. One can not read these plain truths, honestly uttered by the distinguished lecturer, without a feeling of regret that he does not always remember what his logic demanded when he stood opposed to the infidel world. We may be permitted to make a quotation from the argument alluded to, both for its intrinsic worth and as illustrating the position forced upon the great minds of the creed-

Churches when they are called before the world on the evidences of Christianity. He says:

"It is not to be assumed, then, by the Christian or the infidel, that we have in fact, in our creeds and in our interpretation of the Bible, *precisely* the system which was revealed. That we have the true record in the Bible we are to believe, and the infidel may hold us to that; but that we have the proper *interpretation* of that record is not to be assumed as certain. Christianity has been transmitted to us from a far-distant age. It has come in contact with all the philosophical systems in the world. Its outward form has been much moulded by philosophy—much by its alliance with the state. The synods and councils which have determined the creeds of the Church have been, like other assemblies, composed of unperfect men—often of men more under the influence of philosophy than religion; often ignorant of the plainest rules of exegesis: and often seeking rather to establish a hierarchy than to promote the kingdom of Christ. As a matter of fact, we know that during that long period there is almost no absurdity of doctrine or interpretation which has not been embraced by the Church; almost no error which has not been sanctioned by synods and councils; almost no truth the belief of which has not exposed him who held it to persecution by the Church itself. Christianity has thus come down to us through a descent of eighteen centuries, collecting in its progress whatever of good or bad there might be that could in any way be made to adhere to it; adopting as its own the opinions in mental philosophy, and the doctrines of science, true or false, which have prevailed in the world; and uniting all in its symbols of faith—taking the Church at large, a vast and monstrous conglomeration of original sacred truth, and of the errors and absurdities which the world has accumulated in the lapse of ages. It is a ship, not now just sailing out of port, fresh and new and clean, but one that has sailed afar, and that has collected in distant seas whatever of barnacles and sea-weed that could be made

to adhere to it. *Those barnacles and that sea-weed must be detached from it if the ship is to be made to traverse safely distant seas again.*

"A great part of the work of the Church in modern times has been to *detach* from it the errors and corruptions which it had accumulated in the long period of its history. This was, in fact, the main service which Luther rendered to the Church, restoring it, in a great measure, to its pristine beauty, purity, and vigour. This is the service which has been rendered by modern sacred criticism; this is the work to be done by the efforts to secure a correct text of the Bible; this is the work to be done by the application of the canons of criticism to the Word of God.

"Luther indeed, performed a great work; for Christianity in the Protestant form is a different thing from what it was as it had been presented to the world for a thousand years. But, we are not to *assume* that the work was wholly done by him, or that in the Westminster, Helvetic, and the Savoy Confessions, in the Thirty-nine Articles, or the Heidelberg Catechism, we have Christianity *precisely* as its Author designed to communicate it to mankind. We are not to assume that all the received views in the Church are true views, and in no manner to be modified. We are not to assume that the texts of Scripture which the Westminster Assembly affixed to the Larger and Shorter Catechism are all properly applied, and are to be held as proof-texts now, in order to 'soundness in the faith,' or that the doctrines which they are designed to defend *are*, in fact, *doctrines of the Scripture at all.*"

Here it is plainly shown that these creeds may all need correcting in order to tally with Christianity; and yet it is the common custom in ecclesiastical circles to excommunicate a man who proposes to compare the creed with the Bible, with a view to correcting the former.

L. R. GAULT.

GETTING RIGHT.

WE believe in the compulsion of truth—that whether Churches like it or not the truth will triumph over them and compel them to take to its ways. They will do it, because they find themselves unable to prosper otherwise. It would be an easy matter to record monthly instances

in which the ways of truth and of right press themselves into Churches—one here and another there. Take two recent instances—

1. Concerning a London Presbyterian Church, of which the "Rev." J. T. Davidson is pastor, we have the following:—

"It appears that the services in the Agricultural Hall just by have led to an increased demand for religious agency in that district. Hundreds who attended no place of worship have now been induced to do so. Hundreds who were careless about religion have now become concerned. Hundreds who a short while ago would have refused the gift of a tract, and would have shut their doors in the face of a Christian visitor, are now ready to receive the one and to listen to the *visæ vocæ* instruction of the other. On Sunday evening Mr. Davidson, instead of preaching a sermon, organised as it were, a public meeting, yet not exactly a public meeting, (for there was no chairman, there were no rhetorical fireworks, no murmurs of applause) the aim of which was to elicit co-operation in evangelistic work in that particular locality. Belonging to their congregation there are some two hundred young men. How much can they do if they have but the willing heart.

The service commenced in the usual manner by the singing of a hymn. Mr. Davidson who was in his pulpit and wore his gown then offered prayer, leading up to what was to be the peculiarity of that evening's service. He then delivered a short address explanatory of the circumstances in which that meeting had been originated, and which had led to the visit of the deputation who were to address them that night. The masses felt that on the whole the Christians were their best friends—those most ready to do them good temporally as well as spiritually. Especially was it so in that particular district. The Church was much to blame in that it had not been more ready to take advantage of this feeling and to turn it to proper account. People had often been driven away from places of worship. As an illustration Mr. Davidson said that in one of the churches in that locality a young man entered and took his seat one Sunday evening. Presently the lady to whom the pew belonged came in; she said to the young man, harshly, "This is my pew, you have no business here." The young man took up his hat and walked out, resolving never to enter a place of worship again. In a week after he was dead.

In their various societies, continued Mr. Davidson, there was ample room for all; some were more fitted for one kind of work than another, but they wanted workers of all kinds. There was a large amount of

Christian talents amongst them lying waste, and they were losers, no one could say to how great an extent, through all eternity, in consequence. The rev. gentleman then called on Mr. Mathieson, banker of Lombard Street, who stood up in the table pew, and, after a short prayer, proceeded to read a few verses from Matthew's Gospel, describing how the multitude were fed in the wilderness with seven loaves and a few small fishes. He then addressed the people. Another hymn was sung, and then Dr. A. P. Stuart, a medical man, spoke briefly yet energetically on the living Christ, and the constraining power of His death and resurrection as the most powerful and only stimulus to Christian zeal. The discourse was constructed on two passages in Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, in which he shows how the love of Christ was the motive power, and how necessity was laid on Him in consequence to preach the Gospel. Mr. Davidson closed the service in the usual way. The experiment was a bold one, but none present could have regretted it. Why should not qualified laymen give addresses in our chapels and churches on special occasions?"

The above is abridged from the *Christian World*. When Bankers and Doctors preach on Sunday evenings in large chapels, the parson's gown, bands, and tub-pulpit will have soon to be dispensed with, that elders and platforms may take their place. So much for the innovation in a London orthodox church! But we have another slip:—

2. "At a meeting of the Unitarian Board recently held in Manchester, the "Rev." J. Panton Ham, of London, observed that it was a great mistake that the main burden of the ministry should rest upon professional ministers. It was as much others' duty as his to fulfil clerical functions. He quite disclaimed any monopoly of ministerial functions, for the ministerial office was a function which devolved upon the whole Church (applause)."

Here the testimony comes from the other extreme. But whether orthodox or heterodox, under the compulsion of truth, our neighbours must move out of their old positions.

D. K.

MEMOIRS OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL: Embracing a view of the origin, progress, and principles, of the Religious Reformation which he advocated. By ROBERT RICHARDSON. Vol. II.

THE second volume of this deeply interesting book is now published; and, contrary to our expectation, completes the work. The only

fault we found with the *first* is altogether avoided in the second. Had it not been so another volume would have been needed. Unimportant incidents, which in the first volume were extended beyond reasonable length, are not so treated in the second. It is a volume replete with information, and yet not at all heavy. Readers of the two volumes can hardly fail to be highly pleased and much instructed. It is not neces-

sary to give an outline of contents, because our readers, generally, know the leading features of the remarkable life which Dr. Richardson has so well, faithfully, and modestly unfolded. On the other hand, no one acquainted with the general outline will regret perusing these books, as certainly they will enable him to comprehend that life as he has not before done.

DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

LECTURE ON THE GODHEAD OF CHRIST.—On Wednesday evening a lecture was delivered at the Unitarian Chapel, Oxford-street, by the Rev. W. Mitchell, the subject being "The introductory chapters of St. John's gospel no proof of the Deity of Christ." Mr. Mills occupied the chair, and there was a moderate attendance.—At the close of the lecture, Mr. Robbins asked Mr. Mitchell if he would consent to discuss the Godhead of Christ with Mr. King, of Birmingham.—Mr. Mitchell expressed his willingness to do so.

The foregoing notice appeared in the *Accrington Times* and called forth the following letter to the editor of that paper:

To the Editor of the *Accrington Times*.

SIR,—In reporting a lecture by the "Rev." W. Mitchell, you intimate that the lecturer was asked whether he would discuss the question with Mr. King, of Birmingham, and that he expressed his willingness to do so. Will you permit me to say that the introduction of my name on that occasion was entirely without my knowledge; that no one in Accrington is authorized to make proposals on my behalf; and that though I have numerous friends

in Lancashire I have no acquaintance in your town, and, therefore, I could not name a resident committee were a discussion contemplated.

Permit me to add, that though I have engaged in set public debates with Mr. Holyoake, Mr. Ellis, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Watts and others, yet I am not specially engaged in that kind of work, and only enter upon it when in some special way it is thrust upon me. As to Unitarianism, I look upon it as an outpost of Infidelity, and deem it a part of Christian work and duty to refute it. But at present I see no reason why I should run into Accrington to meet Mr. Mitchell. Were he in Birmingham I would at once respond, but surely there are ministers in Accrington able and willing to meet him, if his position is important enough to demand it. If such is not the case—if they cannot or will not—I should then feel myself called into that portion of the field were a respectable local committee to urge me to take up their cause, but certainly not otherwise. Yours truly,

DAVID KING,

Bethphage House, Belgrave Road,
Birmingham.

REMOVED TO WHERE THERE IS NOT A CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR.—The question of removal to where there is not a church, being an important one, has called forth a response in your January number. It seems that a hundred brethren are scattered about in places where there is no church of the primitive faith and order. A question arises—Where are they? It would be a curious fact were there not two in some towns. But I might pass a brother daily for months and not know him to be one. Now, if all such were to send to the *B. H.* an intimation of their whereabouts good might be achieved, both to themselves and to others. Again, as a people we say—

"Preach the gospel to every creature." But, whether from insufficiency of preachers or of funds I know not, our preaching is almost exclusively where there are churches. We need to *plant* churches as well as to bring souls into the existing churches; and I doubt not that there are lone brothers who, if they had some help, would be the means of planting churches. If our Evangelists, as they pass from church to church could give a few discourses where there is not a church, but a disciple or two, blessed results might be accomplished. Let us pray for the harvest field to be enriched with earnest labourers. T. H. FLETCHER.

REMARKS.

WE shall be happy to keep a list of all isolated brethren, who keep up a correspondence with the churches they have removed from. It would not be well to publish a name, now and then, as one might be sent, but to keep a record and supply information on application.

The suggestion of preaching, as there is passing opportunity, where we have not a church and do not anticipate protracted effort, is good and very desirable. Perhaps the feeling that it is not desirable to neglect weak churches in order to plant others smaller and weaker

still, has been allowed to prevail too much. Preach the gospel to every creature if you can. Not being able to do that, get as near to it as possible; and, therefore, when an effort can be put forth to gain a companion for the isolated brother, by all means let it be so. On the other hand, isolated Christians should not remain very long without companions. Earnest prayer, loving effort, by tracts and conversation, and a consistent life, *must* bring some soul or souls to obey the Lord. Let the lonely one, who has health, see to it that he win another soul to Christ.

ED.

LETTER FROM W. HINDLE.

Feb. 11th, 1870.

Dear Br. King,—Having decided to labour as an Evangelist in Australia, I intend (D.V.) to sail from Liverpool in the Great Britain Steam Ship, which is to start on Saturday, the 19th of March. Before I leave old England and the many dear brothers and sisters in Christ, with whom I have had sweet fellowship in the Gospel, I want to say a few words to them through the pages of the *Harbinger*, and also to some of my friends who may read the *Harbinger*, but who are not yet in Christ. I only wish that I could put on paper what I feel in my heart for both brethren and friends; but I shall not be able to do this. However, let me say to my brethren in Christ that I thank *them* with all my heart for the sympathy and help that I have received in my work for nearly five years. I would ask for a *continued* interest in their sympathy and prayers. If the apostle Paul needed the prayers of his brethren, surely the labourers in the great harvest field have the same need now. Dear brethren, pray for me, that I may have a prosperous journey and liberty and power to preach the glorious Gospel of Christ on board the ship; and that I may have much

success in winning souls to Christ in a foreign land; I will not cease to pray to our Heavenly Father that His richest blessings may rest upon you and your families and the Churches in dear old England. And now, my dear brethren, may the God of peace and love be with you and bless you, and keep you steadfast, unmoved, and always abounding in his blessed work. And when the conflict and the toil of this present life are past, may we all meet in Heaven. Amen.

In conclusion let me say to those who read this—who are not in Christ—how long will you keep the Saviour knocking and waiting at the door of your hearts; how long will you continue in the downward road? Oh let me once more entreat you to give your hearts to the Lord Jesus, and do it now! Behold *now* is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation; Christ is worthy of your confidence and worthy of your love, and the best service that you can render to Him. May you, dear reader, make the wise choice and follow Jesus in loving obedience until we meet Him in glory.

WM. HINDLE.

EXEGETICAL ITEMS.

THE printers of our version have smothered an old Saxon word in 1 Tim. ii. 9. For "Shame-facedness" read "Shame-fastness," a word purely Saxon, and formed like "steadfastness." The Saxon form is *scam-fæst-nes*, from *scamu*—shame, and *fæst*—firm or fast.

—Another obsolete Saxon word in our Bible is "earing," which occurs three times in the Pentateuch with a reference

to agriculture; viz.: Gen. xv. 6; Exod. xxxiv. 21; Deut. xxi. 4. What is "earing-time?" Most readers think of the time when the grain begins to ripen in the ear, and in Saxon ear means the head of wheat, while an animal's ear is *care*. But this is not the meaning of "earing-time." It comes from the Saxon word *erian*—to plow or *ered*—plowed. "Earing time" is plowing-time, and "a valley

neither eared nor sown" is one that has been neither plowed nor sown.

The Preacher says: "The words of the wise [are] as goads, and as nails fastened [by] the masters of assemblies, [which] are given from one shepherd." The second clause of the verse is often quoted, but what does it mean? Did the Moderator or Chairman of Hebrew assemblies keep order by "punching heads" in that style? Sharpe, in his Revision of the Authorized Version, translates it thus: "The words of the wise are as goads, and as stakes fastened by the owners of the flocks, when they are given up by a shepherd." This makes better sense, and does not bring in chairmen of meetings between the ox driver's goad and the shepherd.

"Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine." 1 Tim. v. 17.

This is a stock text in defence of Presbyterian order. It divides the presbyters of the Church into three classes (1) elders who neither ruled nor preached; (2) elders who ruled and did not teach or preach; (3) elders who both ruled, preached and taught. Every thing in controversy turns upon the duties of the second class. The word "ruling" is in Greek *proistos*, and means "standing forth." It occurs elsewhere, as in Rom. xli. 8, "He that ruleth, [let him do it] with diligence." Our translators seem to take it as implying the management of Church business and the administration of Church discipline. In classic Greek it certainly sometimes has such a meaning, but no passage in the New Testament fixes that sense upon it. Justin Martyr (who died A.D. 165) in his "First Apology," describes the weekly worship of the primitive Christians. He says, cap. (lxvii): "When the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs and exhorts." Again: "The President offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying Amen." Again: "What is collected is deposited with the president, who succours the orphans and widows." Again (cap. lxx): "There is then brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of wine mixed with water, and, he taking them gives praise and glory to the Father

of the Universe, and offers thanks at considerable length." &c. These extracts show the true sense of *proistos*. He was the presiding officer of a Christian assembly, while the worship of God was celebrated, and took part in the instruction of the Christian people. "Let the elders that preside well," &c., is Paul's meaning.

"When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, etc. 2 Cor. xiv. 26. How could it be that "every one hath a psalm?" To understand this we must lay aside for the minute our occidental conceptions of poetry and music. (1) The early Christians had no strictly metrical, much less formal and rhymed poetry. The poetry of the Bible has neither metre nor rhyme. A free and irregular rhythm, and a construction in parallelism is all that formally distinguishes it from prose. It was as easy to extemporize a psalm as a prayer, and probably as common. (2) They had no fixed tunes of necessity, in singing such psalms. Indeed they did not sing at all, in our sense of the word sing. They chanted or intoned them in a tone varying in pitch and rapidity according to the meaning of the words. Most probably their prayers were uttered in a tone somewhat similar. It is not probable that either our speaking tone or our singing tone was ever heard in these Oriental Churches. The Old Scotch Covenanters in their delivery of sermons, and the modern Ritualists in their prayers, preserve the fashion. The close line drawn between prayer and praise in the West was not known in the East, as every reader of the Book (or rather the Five Books) of the Psalms must have seen. The second of the Five Books closes with the words: "The prayers of David, the Son of Jesse are ended." Prayer in Eastern worship differed little from praise. It was thrown into the same rhythmical form, uttered in the same style of chant, and responded to with a hallelujah or an amen by the mass of the people. We have got farther on in the matter of uniting all voices, but only by banishing the extemporary element out of praise. Americans of African descent, in some parts of the land, still adhere to Scriptural usage, and the leader extemporizes the hymn while the people join in the chorus.—*Am. Presbyterian.*

THE TAUCHNITZ NEW TESTAMENT.

THE Baron Tauchnitz, the great publisher of Leipzig, Germany, as is well known to most scholars, has for several years past been issuing a series of English classics, for the

benefit of his countrymen, among whom a decided taste for English literature has lately sprung up. About a year ago (Christmas, 1868,) he issued volume 1,000 of this se-

ries; and by way of marking it as an event in his business, he selected the English New Testament as the work which should crown this great labor.

And this edition is worthy of the purpose which it is intended to subserve. I do not speak of the paper, type, or binding as being extraordinary, for the Tauchnitz editions are cheap, and intended for universal circulation.

He has procured the services of the learned Dr. Constantine Tischendorf to edit it, with the variations of the three oldest manuscripts in existence, viz: the Alexandrian, now in the British Museum; the Vatican, in the Vatican Library at Rome, and the Sinaitic, now at St. Petersburg.

When it is remembered that the authorized version was made from manuscripts of a date later than the 10th century, and that the Alexandrian, the youngest of these, is referred to the middle of the 5th, whereas the other two are referred to the middle of the 4th century, the importance and the authority of these variations will be apparent.

Beyond all question the oldest and the best of these is the Sinaitic manuscript, discovered by Prof. Tischendorf himself in a convent on Mount Sinai.

There are many controversies settled by these ancient texts, and many theories based upon spurious readings are by them rendered untenable.

For instance, in the debate with Rice, Mr. Campbell averred that all the versions, ancient and modern, which had been made into other languages from the Greek, sustained his position concerning *bapto* and *baptizo*; that these words were never

rendered by any word meaning to *pour* or to *sprinkle*; but always by some word meaning to *dip* or its equivalent. Mr. Rice triumphantly referred to the Peschito Syriac version, one of the oldest, if not the very oldest, translation of the New Testament extant, which in Rev. xix: 13, renders *bebammenon* by a word meaning *sprinkled*. Furthermore, he stated that the Vulgate, translated by Jerome, rendered it the same way: *Et vestitus erat veste ASPERSA sanguine*, "He was clothed with a vesture *sprinkled* with blood." Origen, also, the most learned of the Greek fathers, had quoted the passage using *rantizo* instead of *bapto*. And Mr. Rice asked, with the assurance common to men of his information, if Origen did not understand his own language?

Mr. Campbell, in his reply, with that intuitive certainty, which his immense researches in this field gave him, urged that Origen quoted, and that the Peschito Syriac and Vulgate were translated from a more ancient text than we now possessed, and that *errantismenon* was the true reading. And so it proved. In the very next year (1844) Providence brought to light a venerable document hidden for ages in the Arabian desert, and lo! it reads *errantismenon* instead of *bebammenon*!

The further we go back into antiquity, the nearer we come to apostolic times, the firmer becomes the ground upon which we as a people stand, and the greater grows the certainty that the word of God will prevail over all human reasonings and "perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds."

W. C. DAWSON.

Apostolin Times.

CHRISTIANITY V. SECULARISM—LECTURES IN DARWEN.

MR. BRADLAUGH's third series of evasions, for the purpose of escaping a discussion, which his friends thrust upon Mr. King, and which he pre-

tends to have accepted, having been brought to a close, the following placard was posted in the neighbourhood of Darwen (Lancashire):—

"Christianity v. Secularism.—Three Lectures will (D.V.) be delivered in the Co-operative Hall, by David King, Editor of the *British Harbinger*, on Sunday and Monday, Jan. 30 and 31. Sunday afternoon at 2:30—*The House that God Built and the One He is Now Building*—chair to be taken by W. Snape, Esq. Sunday evening, 6 o'clock—*The Criminality and ultimate Utility of Sin*—chair to be taken by the Rev. W. Davies. Monday evening at 7 o'clock—*Secularism: Its Moral Basis and Results*—chair to be taken by the Rev. P. Graham, J.P. Questions or Discussion invited, subject to the discretion of the chairman. Admission free."

The Hall, which is estimated to hold some 1,500 or 1,600 people, was completely crowded, and on the Monday night we were told, a quarter of an hour before the time, that there was no getting in. The chairmen represented three denominations—Mr. Snape being a deacon in a Baptist Church, Mr. Davies minister of an Independent Church, and Mr. Graham a clergyman of the State Church. After each lecture an half hour was allowed to Secularists; at the close of which Mr. King replied. The local press gave considerable reports. The following, omitting the outline of the lectures, is from the *Preston Herald*:—

"Formonthspast Darwen has been visited at intervals by several itinerant infidel lecturers sent out by Bradlaugh and Co., who have attempted by their dangerous doctrines to subvert Christianity and revolutionise the faith of the nation. Not that we fear Christianity would suffer from their puny attacks, but their arguments are such as appeal to the lower instincts of human nature, and the young people especially are apt to be led away by their unmeaning claptrap, because of range of passion excess and vicious indulgence they may allow themselves with impunity, according to infidel notions. Most of our readers will be aware that considerable correspondence has taken place relative to the consummation of a discussion upon the vital points of Christianity v. Infidelity, between Mr. King and Mr. Bradlaugh, but there has been such evasion on the part of Mr. Bradlaugh, that it was impossible to complete the arrangements. Mr. King, therefore, at the request of an influential committee, came down from Birmingham to back out the cause of which he is so able an advocate; and right well did he do it. As an unmitigable proof of the unanimity of feeling

on religious points in Darwen, we may mention that the room was crowded in every part by Christians of every denomination, whilst hundreds were unable to gain admittance. The lecture in the afternoon commenced at half-past two—the chair was occupied by W. Snape, Esq., of Darwen. After the lecture the Chairman declared the meeting open, and stated that anyone might offer any remarks or ask any question relative to the lecture.—Mr. Blacker, one of the Secularists in Darwen, said Mr. King had presumed they took the Scriptures for granted. He had not proved his position. He had assumed the inspiration of the Bible; he had assumed the truthfulness of the doctrines of the types of the Old Testament which Christians themselves were not agreed on. After some further remarks, which met with disapprobation from the audience, he sat down.

Another Man from the body of the hall, of the same class as the former speaker, and who had evidently libated pretty freely at the shrine of Bacchus, rose to ask a question, but instead of doing so indulged in some very incoherent remarks.

Mr. King then replied to the objections that had been raised, and elicited, by his ready replies, the plaudits of the audience.

In the evening the subject was, "*The Criminality and Ultimate Utility of Sin.*" The Rev. Thomas Davies occupied the chair. The hall was again crowded in every part.

The chairman, in introducing the lecturer, asked them to judge of what he would say in a spirit of fairness.

After the lecture. The chairman, in declaring that meeting open, said that the lecture was remarkable for its logical consecutiveness, and for constantly keeping in view the one point which has been announced as the subject of the lecture.

Mr. Blacker asked a number of questions, some of which were scarcely relevant to the subject, and so intemperate was his language that the chairman had to interrupt him.

Mr. King, in his usual courteous way, responded in a satisfactory manner. On Monday evening, "*Secularism: Its Moral Basis and Results,*" was the subject. Mr. King delivered his lecture to a crowded meeting, in the Co-operative Hall, Over Darwen. There were present on the platform—The Rev. P. Graham (in the chair) W. Snape, Esq., D. Graham, Esq., J. Gregson, Esq., J. Walsley, Esq., D., Ainsworth, Esq.; Messrs. D. Fish, Cooper, Shorrocks, Bates, Turner, &c., The lecturer, on entering the platform, accompanied by his supporters, was loudly cheered.

The chairman, after the applause with which he was greeted had subsided, said: Before proceeding to the business of the evening, he wished, in the first place, to tell them what the subject of the lecture would

be, namely, "Secularism: its moral basis and results." That was the subject of Mr. King's lecture that evening, and the programme for carrying it out would be that, after the lecturer had finished, any person would be allowed to ask questions on, or make remarks in reference to, the lecture, provided those questions and remarks bore strictly upon that subject; but if they did not confine themselves to the subject touched upon by Mr. King, he should feel it his duty to interpose. He thought it was right to state that at the commencement—(hear, hear). They must bear in mind that he was not there as a partisan; he was there to carry out those proceedings without any partiality to anybody—(hear, hear, and applause). After Mr. King's lecture, there would be half an hour allowed for discussion.

After the lecture a number of questions were asked, which Mr. King suitably replied to.

The Rev. E. D. Green proposed a vote of thanks to Mr. King for his lecture.

W. Snape, Esq., seconded the motion.

The chairman having put the motion to the meeting, it was carried with acclamation."

Before the lectures the Secularists had done their utmost, through the press, to make the impression that Mr. King is not worth the serious attention of Mr. Bradlaugh, that he cannot defend Christianity, is not orthodox, and would not be countenanced by ministers of the denominations; but the meetings and attendant circumstances compelled them to change their tune; and, accordingly, a letter was requested to be read on the Monday, which set forth, that as the Christians of Darwen had accepted Mr. King as their champion, the Secularists wished to know whether he would meet Mr. Bradlaugh in debate. The question was *ridiculous* and the answer *crushing*. It was shown that Mr. Bradlaugh had for years been dodging away from the debate, that he could enter upon it when ever he pleased, only that it must be of sufficient extent to do justice; that

he would not be allowed to escape with two nights' rambling all over the Bible.

Mr. Bradlaugh has been pleading that *he* is not willing to sustain the *loss* consequent upon a *protracted* discussion with Mr. King, who insists that the debaters shall not receive any portion of the money charged for admittance. But it now seems that his Darwin friends, rather than remain smarting under their defeat, offer to pay him; but they cannot get hold of him even at that. In the "*Reformer*," of Feb. 6, he says: "If a Darwin clergyman challenged us we might suffer pecuniary loss to meet him; but with Mr. King it is out of the question. We cannot accept your offer to pay us out of your own pocket; the game is not worth the powder." In so putting it he is perfectly right. Powder expended to the wounding of the sportsman, while *the game* goes unhurt, is, certainly, not satisfactorily used; but it is quite satisfactory to know that Mr. B. understands the nature of the case. But how valiant and disinterested he is! He would meet a "Darwin clergyman," without fee or reward. This is perfectly well understood—he knows that he is not likely to be indulged, as not one clergyman in a hundred has gone at all into that line of advocacy which fits a man for public debate; and he knows, too, that a State-Church minister would afford him a handle, in his perverting of Christianity, by having to defend, at least, certain things that do not appertain to Christianity as sanctioned by Christ and His apostles. He is not afraid of Mr. King, but he is afraid of fairly dealing with Christianity as it is in the Book.

ITEMS OF NEWS.

AUSTRALIA.—(From the *Pioneer*).—ADELAIDE.—On November 2nd we held our first anniversary tea-meeting in White's Room. After tea, the meeting was presided over by Br. T. Margary, and addresses

were delivered by the chairman and brethren G. Goudy, T. Porter, T. J. Gore, and a few remarks were offered by myself. The choir added much to the enjoyment of the evening. The report showed an in-

crease of 206 during the year; nine members having been commended to sister Churches in the country. We have now a total membership of 210 in fellowship. The next day a tea meeting of the Sunday School in connection with the Church was held. The report was very cheering and encouraging, both to the School and the teachers. Our meetings continue to be largely attended, and a good interest prevails. During the past month *sixteen* have been added to the Church. For the information of the brethren, I will state that (D.V.) I purpose, early in January, to leave Adelaide for a few months on a visit to America, with a threefold object in view, namely—to improve my health, to consummate arrangements there, for the further advancement of our Redeemer's kingdom in the Australian colonies and New Zealand, and to see once more in the flesh my dear parents, relatives, and friends.

H. S. EARL.

HINDMARSH.—Two have been added to the Church during the past month.

T. PORTER.

MILANG, Nov. 20.—Since our notice last month, we have immersed *four* persons into the names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and we trust they will exhibit the fruits of the Spirit in rich abundance in their future course.

S. JUDD.

STIRLING.—Since our report for last month, *four* have submitted themselves to the authority of Jesus by faith, repentance, and immersion, and have united with the Church, save one whose parents, in a persecuting spirit have endeavoured to prevent her union with us.

GEO. GOUDY.

STRATHALBYN.—On Tuesday, Oct. 26, I left Adelaide for Strathalbyn (a distance of 35 miles), and preached the same evening to a large and attentive audience. During the week I also held other services, and on Lord's-day we had a very fine attendance and interest. In the afternoon I delivered a brief discourse on the ordinance of 'Christian Baptism,' on the banks of the river Angas, and then baptized *four* persons into Christ, in the presence of about six hundred persons. The most undivided attention was given and most solemn interest prevailed throughout the whole service. The next day I formed a Church of Christ there, composed of *twenty-three* members; several of the members being the results of the labors of brethren G. Goudy and S. Judd, at Belvidere, near Strathalbyn. Br. Crawford of Milang was present and took part in the services. Before I left for Adelaide I was happy to learn that three others had decided for Christ, and a good number were 'almost persuaded to be Christians.' My labors have been well followed up by bre-

thren Gore, Porter, and S. Judd. To the Lord's name be everlasting praises!—

H. S. EARL.

WILLUNGA, Nov. 24.—The work of the Lord is still prospering at this place. The audiences are large and attentive, and a fine interest is prevailing. During the past month *five* have been added to the Church, and the prospect of other additions is cheering. Preparations are going on for the erection of the chapel, and ere long we hope to see the foundation laid.— H. S. EARL.

BRECHWORTH, Nov. 14.—The Church here is moving on in peace and harmony. We have of late had *four* added to our number by faith and baptism. J. T.

BEAUMARIS, Nov. 7.—During the past month *two* young persons have made 'the good confession' and obeyed the Saviour in the ordinance of Christian baptism.

WILLIAM RUSE.

DONCASTER, BULLKEN, November 8.—I have concluded my labors here, and am about to return to Brighton. I shall carry with me many pleasing and grateful recollections of kindness received from the brethren during my sojourn amongst them. Since my last report, I have had the pleasure of baptizing *two*, and *one* has been restored. Brighton and Beaumaris will now receive my attention, God helping me.

S. H. COLES.

MELBOURNE, Nov. 23.—Since last report the Church of Christ here has received *nineteen* additions, *fourteen* by faith, repentance, and obedience, *three* by commendation, and *two* restored. A series of meetings was held in the Foresters' Hall, Collingwood, commencing on Oct. 20th, and closing on the evening of the 25th; the weather was unfavorable, being very wet most of the time; *four* converts have been the immediate fruit of this effort; G. L. Surber preached on two of the evenings, and T. J. Gore, from Adelaide, on the other four. T. J. Gore's clear and earnest presentation of the truth gained him the friendship of all those who love the faithful preacher for his work's sake. The *fourth* annual tea meeting, in connection with the Church in Lygon St. was held in the Chapel on Oct. 19th. Over 300 sat down to tea; the opportunity was seized by many to renew old acquaintances, and form new ones. A public meeting was held afterwards, when R. Dick, occupied the chair. The place was crowded. Addresses were given by R. Dick, G. C. Lawson, O. A. Carr, S. H. Coles, T. J. Gore, and G. L. Surber. In the financial statement, were the following items:—total income for the year, £1,067; expenditure, £1,097. The evening's proceedings were enlivened by some anthems, which were well sung by the choir. The meeting closed with singing and prayer.

NEW ZEALAND, DUNEDIN, Nov. 1869.—Since my last, *ten* have been added to the Church—*seven* by faith and baptism, and *three* baptized believers from the Baptists. 'They went everywhere preaching the Word.' This inspired record had a very interesting illustration here last week. There is a brother in the country fifty miles out, young in the *faith*, but not weak in *faith*, a plain man, but earnest and possessed in *divine knowledge and wisdom of heart* as well as head, who has awakened such an interest among those around him, that two elderly females in a buggy, accompanied by a mutual acquaintance on horseback, made the whole distance (fifty miles) *one day's* journey, in their desire to obey their Lord and Saviour in His own appointed way. The three were baptized on Thursday night (day after arrival); they met with the Church on the Lord's-day following, and the next day went on their way rejoicing. We purpose to make some arrangement for Brother Wright to visit them, as there are evidences that a Church might be formed in that locality. Another with us travelled nine miles *one Lord's-day* morning to be baptized. He was baptized, then added to the Church, and broke bread in remembrance of his Saviour, and went away in peace and joy to his bush home at night.—
J. BUTTARS.

NOTES ON A JOURNEY.—Being requested by the Church in GLASGOW to visit that city for a short time, I left Birmingham on the 30th Dec., and continued with them three Lord's-days. The meetings for teaching and preaching were kindly thrown open to me, both on Lord's-days and also through the week, to speak either to brethren or strangers, which I gladly did. Although the Church here has been working chiefly in a private way, yet it has been successful in the past year in adding a number of souls unto the saved. The brethren appear to be alive to their responsibilities to spread the glad news, and are seeking as far as lies in their power to do so. Leaving Glasgow I then spent ten days in my native town, DUNDEE. On Lord's-day afternoon we had a good meeting in Watt Hall, when I preached the Gospel to an attentive audience. Gladly would I have lingered among the brethren here, but could not. Understanding that Br. King was to lecture at DARWEN, on the 30th and 31st December, I deviated from the straight course to Birmingham, and was present at the Anti-secularist meetings. They were certainly a success, and the tide of sceptical influence in that locality has, in the meantime, been rolled back. The lecturer, from what I could observe, may expect a hearty reception from the people of Darwen when he returns; and then we hope he will take the platform in the advocacy of primitive

Christianity, for now there is a willing ear. While in this locality I visited with Br. King, on the Lord's-day, the Church at BLACKBURN. We met a goodly number of earnest brethren and had from them the right hand of fellowship. From thence I went on to WIGAN, and while there enjoyed the fellowship of the brethren; I preached twice in their commodious Chapel, besides taking part in their cottage meetings. I left Wigan, January 5, for MANCHESTER, there I spent four days, we had good meetings on Lord's-day morning and evening, when I was privileged to speak to brethren and others, holding up Jesus as the only Saviour. At the weekly prayer-meetings we communed together in divine things. And now I am safely back again in Birmingham to resume my studies and labours, feeling refreshed in body and mind; thankful to the Lord for bringing me thus far, and hoping that still by His grace a way will be opened up into a field of future usefulness.
J. ADAM.

NOTTINGHAM AND BULWELL.—Since last month's report I have been to the Churches at the above places, speaking on Lord's-days and week nights. We had good meetings at each place. The Church in Barker Gate, Nottingham, is very energetic, sending out a band of preachers every Lord's-day, who work in harmony with the Churches of the district. The Church at Bulwell is not behind in this great work, they send out into the adjoining neighbourhoods, on the first day, four or five worthy laborers, in whom the word of Christ dwells richly. This Church, I am glad to find, is blessed with an able pastorate. An Evangelist of the right sort would find in this district no end of openings for hard and pleasant labor, and always enjoy a most hearty, loving support from the Churches. I have now reached Wortley, Leeds, on my way for Northumberland.
EDWARD EVANS.

WHITEHAVEN.—The Church here has been cheered by the visit of Br. D. Scott, district Evangelist. Four have been immersed by him and added to the saved during the last fortnight. One has also been restored to the Church.
G. S.

Obituary.

SARAH CARTER fell asleep in Jesus on the 27th of January, aged 72 years. She was immersed when 15 years of age. She was a member of the Church in Lincoln. T. J. B.

JOSEPH BAILEY departed this life on Lord's Day, January 23rd, 1870, aged 77. For about three years he was in fellowship with the Church, Summer Lane, Birmingham. For many years previously he was a baptized believer in connexion with Cannon Street Chapel, Birmingham. He was greatly beloved, and died in peace. H. P.

MARY COULTHARD, after long and painful suffering, which she patiently endured, fell asleep in Jesus, 19th of January, 1870, aged 54 years.—*Whitehaven.* G. S.

MRS. AINSLIE, widow of the late James Ainslie, died in Dundee on the morning of January 19th, 1870.

Family Room.

A STARTLING EXAMPLE.

THERE has just come to my knowledge, in a very direct way, an impressive illustration of that truth which should make every moderate drinker fear and tremble, namely: that the love of drink is a disease. The drunkard is the pitiable and blameworthy victim of his former self. Even after his reform, he is liable to feel that his old habit is ever crouching near, ready to spring upon him in any thoughtless moment.

The case in illustration is this. (it can easily be seen why I should conceal the names of persons and places):—Within the past month there has died, in his early prime, a minister of the gospel, who was first the victim, and at last the conqueror of drink. Some years ago, after a severe illness, he "stimulated" by medical advice. When he had fairly recovered from his disease, he found himself in the coils of a serpent. It was the old story, alas! more than "twice told;" he fell, struggled to rise, stumbled, and fell again. He never resigned himself to his bondage for any considerable length of time, but shook his chains and tried hard to break them. He resolved, and resisted, and prayed, and then in exhaustion yielded. At length he went, as the last resort, to an inebriate asylum. His high Christian character secured for him the respect and esteem of all the inmates and officers. When, after about a year, his cure was supposed to be complete, and he was about to leave, he was desired to remain as chaplain of the institution. But his heart was in the work of the regular pastoral ministry, and he accepted a call to a vacant pulpit. When he

began his labours there, he made a full and frank statement of his infirmity to the congregation. He told them he felt his weakness, and realized that he was subject to a terrible temptation, by which he must fall, unless he was sustained by the grace of God and the sympathies and prayers of good men.

This announcement and appeal won for him the heart of the whole community. He became immensely popular, and laboured with untiring zeal for the salvation of the people. God gave him great success. The Church was revived and its numbers largely increased. The pastor's labours exceeded his strength. He flagged, was tempted to take stimulants—and resisted. By the help of divine grace and human sympathy, *he stood.*

That Church enjoyed the services of its loved pastor only about a year. He sickened and died; but he died a hero; for he conquered the foe which conquered Alexander the Great, and by which "many strong men have been slain."

At his funeral, his wife seemed composed, and almost happy; and after it, she maintained the same demeanour. The officiating clergyman wondering at this, and assuming that it arose from a kind of religious ecstasy, which would soon give place to a corresponding depression, inquired of her about it. "Oh!" said she, "*he's safe!*" You don't know anything about what we have passed through. For years he and I have been standing on the brink of a precipice, trembling with apprehension that, at any time, he might go over. But now *he's safe!*"

O, thou accursed demon of drink ! who art able thus to terrify and imperil even the true and loving disciples of Jesus ; who canst even constrain the tender and loving wife of a devoted and heroic husband to rejoice in the desolate title of "widow ;" would to God that the

forces of truth and purity might be so marshalled and inspired as to throttle thee to death, so that no child of Adam might ever again tremble at the fiery glance of thine eye, or wither in thy baleful breath !

C. D. F.

WILLIAM HAVERLEY.

"ABOUT thirty years ago," said Judge P., "I stepped into a bookstore in Cincinnati, in search of some books that I wanted. While there, a little ragged boy, not over twelve years of age, came in and inquired for a geography."

"Plenty of them," was the salesman's reply.

"How much do they cost?"

"One dollar, my lad."

"I did not know they were so much."

He turned to go out, and even opened the door, but closed it again and came back. "I have only got sixty-one cents," said he ; "could you let me have a geography, and wait a little while for the rest of the money?"

How eagerly his little bright eyes looked up for answer ; and how he seemed to shrink within his ragged clothes when the man, not very kindly, told him he could not !

The disappointed little fellow looked up to me, with a very poor attempt at a smile, and left the store, I followed him and overtook him.

"And what now !" I asked.

"Try another place, sir."

"Shall I go, too, and see how you succeed?"

"O, yes if you like," said he, in surprise.

Four different stores I entered with him, and each time he was refused.

"Will you try again?" I asked.

"Yes, sir, I shall try them all, or I should not know whether I could get one."

We entered the fifth store, and the little fellow walked up manfully, and

told the gentleman just what he wanted, and how much money he had.

"You want the books very much?" said the proprietor.

"Yes sir, very much."

"Why do you want it so very, very much?"

"To study, sir. I can't go to school, but I study when I can at home. All the boys have got one, and they will get ahead of me. Besides my father was a sailor, and I want to learn the places where he used to go."

"Does he go to these places now?" asked the proprietor.

"He is dead," said the boy, softly. Then he added, after a while ; "I am going to be a sailor, too."

"Are you, though?" asked the gentleman, raising his eyebrows curiously.

"Yes, sir, if I live."

"Well, my lad, I will tell you what I will do ; I will let you have a new geography, and you may pay the remainder of the money when you can, or I will let you have one that is not new for fifty cents."

"Are the leaves all in it, and just like the others, only not new?"

"Yes, just like the new ones."

"It will do just as well, then, and I will have eleven cents left toward buying some other book. I am glad that they did not let me have one at any of the other places."

The bookseller looked up inquiringly, and I told him what I had seen of the little fellow. He was much pleased, and when he brought the book along, I saw a nice new pencil and some clean white paper in it.

"A present, my lad, for your perseverance. Always have courage like that, and you will make your mark," said the bookseller.

"Thank you, sir, you are so very good."

"What is your name?"

"William Haverley, sir."

"Do you want any more books?" I now asked him.

"More than I can ever get," he replied, glancing at the books that filled the shelves.

I gave him a bank note. "It will buy some for you, I said."

Tears of joy came into his eyes.

"Can I buy what I want with it?"

"Yes my lad, anything."

"Then I will buy a book for mother," said he, "I thank you very much, and some day I hope I can pay you back."

He wanted my name and I gave it him. Then I left him standing by the counter so happy that I almost envied him, and many years passed before I saw him again.

Last year I went to Europe on one of the finest vessels that ever ploughed the waters of the Atlantic. We had very beautiful weather until very near the end of the voyage, then came a most terrible storm that would have sunk all on board had it not been for the captain.

Every spar was laid low, the rudder was almost useless, and a great leak had shown itself, threatening to fill the ship. The crew were all strong willing men, and the mates were practical seamen of the first class; but after pumping for one whole night, and still the water was gaining upon them, they gave up in despair, and prepared to take the boats, though they might have known that no small boat could ride such a sea. The captain, who had been below with his charts, now came up. He saw how matters stood, and with a

voice that I heard distinctly above the roar of the tempest, he ordered every man to his post.

It was surprising to see those men bow before the strong will of their captain and hurry back to the pumps.

The captain then started below to examine the leak. As he passed me I asked him if there was any hope. He looked at me, then at the other passengers, who had crowded up to hear the reply, and said, rebukingly:

"Yes sir, there is hope as long as one inch of this deck remains above water. When I see none of it, then I shall abandon the vessel, and not before; nor one of my crew, sir. Everything shall be done to save it, and if we fail it will not be from inaction. Bear a hand, every one of you, at the pumps."

Thrice during the day did we despair; but the captain's dauntless courage, perseverance, and powerful will mastered every mind on board, and we went to work again.

"I will land you safely at the dock in Liverpool," said he, "if you will be men."

And he did land us safely; but the vessel sunk, moored to the dock. The captain stood on the deck of the sinking vessel, receiving the thanks and the blessings of the passengers, as they passed down the gang-plank. I was the last to leave. As I passed, he grasped my hand, and said:

"Judge P., do you recognize me?"

I told him that I was not aware that I ever saw him until I stepped aboard his ship.

"Do you remember the boy in Cincinnati?"

"Very well, sir; William Haverley?"

"I am he," said he. God bless you!

"And God bless noble Captain Haverley."

THE AGE OF MAN.

A year ago both Prof. Blake and Prof. Whitney, of California, at Chicago, brought forward evidence in reference to the relics of man

found in California and supposed to point back to an extreme antiquity. Prof. Blake showed stone weapons said to be found at a considerable depth under a hill. Prof. Whitney discredited the relics, because he regarded the hill as geologically much older than the stratum, 10 miles distant, where was found, as he believed, his Calaveras skull; and as its antiquity was as much as he dared to carry, he hesitated to admit any older relics. On the other hand, Prof. Blake was suspicious of the skull, and after some discussion on both "findings" Prof. Blake withdrew his relics for further inquiry. By writing to acquaintances at that place he has learned such facts as throw discredit on both his own relics and on the more famous skull about which so much has been said. Its genuineness is so very doubtful that no arguments can be based upon it in refer-

ence to the antiquity of man on that continent. A similar fate has befallen a late attempt to discover an extreme antiquity of man in the Gulf States. An ancient mound was opened at Natchez, and a large number of human relics were found, which seemed to be extremely ancient, and antiquaries were ready to go back to an indefinite period. But among the relics was a tooth, which is proved to have once inhabited the jaw of a hog; and Prof. Baird insists that it can be nothing else, and that the hog was introduced by the Spaniards. It is not the tooth of the peccary—that would be all right—but the tooth of a pig; and that little pig's tooth, so unfortunately discovered among the debris, blocks the wheels of a splendid archæological discovery, until some one is able to prove that pigs came thousands of years ago to America by the Northwest Passage.

STOP AND THINK!

"Stop, thou thoughtless, reckless man,
Trifling out life's little span,
God and Heaven of you demand,
Stop and think!

Heaven above, and hell below,
Pleasure, pain, and joy and woe,
Repeat the words in accents slow,
Stop and think!

Life's no time for idle dreams,
Life was lent for loftier aims,
Lend your mind to nobler themes;—
Stop and think!

Life calls for thought of sternest hue,
Calls for thought and calls to you,
To your soul's best good be true;
Stop and think!

Live not on without an aim,
Living thus you live in vain—
Do not thus God's love disdain;
Stop and think!

Think how short life's fleeting day;
Think, O think, while now you may,
Death soon will hurry you away;
Stop and think!

Think what work you have to do,
Think what Christ has done for you;
Lo! your Saviour calls anew;
Stop and think!

Else when life has passed away,
And you wasted its brief day,
Nought but this your grief will stay;
You would not think!

Or when time with you is o'er,
And you reached that distant shore
Whence mortal shall return no more,
Thought will be vain.

But if now you think aright,
Soon you'll reach those realms of light,
Clouded ne'er by death or night
Where thought is joy."

He who loves God most will lay out the most for God. More than once in the Scriptures do we read of "the labour of love." Love resteth most when it laboureth most. Nothing labours more or thinks its labour less.

Bad thoughts are worse enemies than lions and tigers; for we can keep out of the way of wild beasts, but bad thoughts win their way everywhere. The cup that is full will hold no more; keep your heart full of good thoughts, that bad thoughts may find no room to enter.

COMMON ERRORS IN RELIGION.

THAT we are saved by any one principle or act, either on our part or on the part of God, though assumed and acted upon by many as true, is, nevertheless, an error of no ordinary magnitude, and doubtless had its origin in the fact that there are some principles and acts so important and necessary that it is impossible to be saved without them. We cannot live without sunshine and water in the natural world, nor with them if we have nothing else. So in the spiritual world, there could be no life without the Sun of Righteousness and the water of life, but without faith and obedience, what were these?

We can not conceive of a sinner being saved unless love were an attribute of the divine character, and it is equally difficult to conceive of it without faith on the part of the sinner. It would be unwise, however, to trust for salvation on the ground that God is a being of infinite love, and unsafe as well as unwise for the sinner to hope for and seek salvation on the ground of faith only. True, man could cherish no hope had love no place in the divine character, nor could the sinner be saved without faith in the Lord Jesus, but it is not true that all mankind will be saved because God loved the world, nor is faith *all* that is necessary on the part of the sinner, because it is true, that without faith, it is impossible to please God. Love, indeed, was the moving principle in the work of man's redemption, but because love dwelt in the bosom of our Heavenly Father, and led Him to devise a way of escape from the thralldom of sin, it does not follow that man's own agency was overlooked, and that the work of the Son and the Spirit were useless.

Because we have a sun in the firmament, we do not think the moon's paler light unnecessary, nor that the stars glow in the midnight sky in vain.

"By grace are ye saved," says an apostle, but he is far from meaning that men are saved by an act of sovereign grace without any conditions of faith or obedience; for the same apostle declares that, "By faith are ye saved." Grace is of God; but faith is the act of man, and to assume that we are saved by one to the exclusion of the other, would be to say that we are saved by an act of God, irrespective of any agency of our own; or, that we are saved by our own act, independently of any aid or favor from God. But Paul asserts that we are saved by the gospel, which is at once the gospel of God, because it sets forth His love—the gospel of Christ, because He is its theme setting forth His work of love and sorrow, His death for our sins, His rising again for our justification, His ascension to and glorification in heaven, where he ever liveth to make intercession for us—the gospel of the Apostles; the grand instrumentality entrusted to them by which they were to win men to Christ, the power of God unto salvation—the gospel of men; theirs, because for them the gospel of salvation; proposed to them for their faith and obedience; full of God's love, of Christ's compassion, and of the Spirit's power, yet saving none save those who save themselves, by laying hold of the hope set before them in its rich and free offer; saving none but those who believe and obey it. As the skill of the physician and the power of the remedy avail not unless the remedy be taken, so the malady of sin can not be cured as long as the sinner refuses to believe on the good Physician, and refuses the only remedy for sin which is proposed in the gospel of His grace.

The saving power of the gospel is not found in any one of its items, or parts, taken separately; as faith alone, grace alone, obedience alone; but in the gospel taken as a plan, a system, a whole; it has its facts for our faith, its

commands and ordinances for our obedience, its promises to comfort and cheer; nor are we permitted to take its facts and neglect its ordinances, to despise its commands and enjoy its promises, they stand or fall together. An engine is powerless to propel the vessel against the wind and tide if boiler, fuel, water or valve be wanting. A watch without main spring is a watch no longer, nor is it a watch with one, only in a useless and imperfect sense, if hands or dial be wanting.—The engine to move the vessel or the watch to mark time, must each have all its parts, and these all in harmonious relation to each other. So with the divine plan for the salvation of men—the gospel. We must receive it as Christ offers it to us in the words of his apostles; we must reject nothing; add nothing; nor may we even disturb, by any change, the harmony of the divine order; for Christ is as much the author of the arrangements of the gospel as He is of its precepts, ordinances, and promises. In presenting the gospel to others, the apostles must be our models; when the gospel is presented to us, we must imitate those who, under their ministry turned to God, by hearing, believing, and obeying the truth.

W. BAXTER.

MINISTRY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.—No. IV.

PROPHETS.

"God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers."—1 Cor. xii. 28.

In his first letter to the Corinthians Paul wrote, "Ye may all prophesy, one by one;" and modern teachers sometimes address the Church in the same words. There is, however, this difference—the persons referred to by Paul were prophets and, therefore, could prophesy, while those now addressed are not prophets and, consequently, cannot. There is *now* no prophet and, as a result, no prophesying.

The words *prophet* and *prophesying* are much misused. With many they relate only to foretelling future events; but in the Bible, whether we take their Hebrew or their Greek equivalents, their meaning is not thus restricted. The prophets of God did foretell things to come, and in so doing they prophesied; but they also very frequently prophesied when there was no allusion to the future. A prophet is one who speaks as he is moved by the Holy Spirit—whenever he prophesies he is inspired. He may or may not speak of the future, but whenever he speaks by inspiration he prophesies.

The apostles of the Saviour were all prophets, but the prophets were not all apostles. The prophets were all teachers, but the teachers were not all prophets—hence it is written, that he gave not only apostles and prophets, but also teachers—and Paul asks, "Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers?" 1 Cor. xii. 28. There are those who say to the church, "Ye may all prophesy one by one"—meaning that all may teach and exhort—whereas it is not true that all may teach, for many are not able, and none are permitted to waste time in that which is not to edification. Neither is it true that an uninspired teacher, however competent to edify, is a prophet. Paul wrote, "Ye may all prophesy one by one," but then he was speaking of those who had the prophetic gift. "Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the others judge. IF ANYTHING BE REVEALED to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace, for ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted, and the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets." 1 Cor. xiv.

31. Inspired men are here clearly referred to—men possessing the word of wisdom and the word of knowledge—a manifestation of the Spirit. No amount of *acquired* knowledge or wisdom would bring its possessor within the prophetic circle—only an allotment of the Holy Spirit could place him there. But does not Paul teach that he who speaketh unto men to edification and exhortation and comfort, prophesieth? Certainly not! That “he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification and exhortation and comfort” (1 Cor. xiv. 3.) is indeed affirmed by Paul, but widely different are the two affirmations. He who speaks, moved by the Holy Spirit is a prophet, and will certainly speak to edification, but it by no means follows that every teacher who speaks to edification is a prophet, or moved by the Holy Spirit. The error is this—Paul, as the context shows, designed to set forth the *effects* of prophesying, in contrast with those resulting from speaking with tongues, whereas he is understood as giving a *definition*. While then prophecy carries with it edification, exhortation, and comfort, speaking to edification, exhortation, and comfort, is not necessarily prophecy.

Notice the words of Peter—“Prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.” 2 Peter i. 21. Inspiration is here clearly included. Then, as we have seen, the prophets were to wait for revelation (1 Cor. xiv. 30), and Paul adds, “If any think himself to be a prophet or *spiritual*, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of God.” 1 Cor. xiv. 37. In this text, to be a prophet is equivalent to being spiritual or inspired. To the prophets God’s secrets, and those of the hearts of men, were revealed. Paul says, “Thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest, and so falling on his face he will worship God, and report that God is in you.” 1 Cor. xiv. 25. Thus it was when the Great Prophet conversed with the woman of Samaria. He told her inmost thoughts and she responded, “Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet.”

But it is claimed that there is also a lower application of the words prophet and prophecy—that while all teachers were not prophets in the higher sense yet, in the “subordinate” sense they were; and, that now it would be no stretch of language to speak of the critically exact expositor as a prophet. But this we must most absolutely deny. The prophets who edified the church by teaching did not obtain their information as do the “critically exact expositors” of our day. They possessed the “word of wisdom” and the “word of knowledge” as gifts direct from the Spirit; their words were the immediate result of inspiration, and it was on that account only that they stood as prophets. To assert a lower or subordinate application of the words is to take unscriptural ground.

Accordingly, in writing to the church in Rome, Paul says, “Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given unto us, whether *prophecy*, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that *teaches* on teaching.” Here *prophesying* and *teaching* are distinguished. So, then, we have now neither prophets nor prophesying. “The Lord gave some apostles, some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers,” and the two former having done the work for which they were required are no longer given—though being dead they yet speak to us in the Scriptures of truth.

Apostles and prophets are spoken of as *gifts*. Of the Saviour it is said that “He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists,

and some pastors and teachers." In what sense were they *given*? In that of being miraculously qualified for their office—each received those supernatural gifts requisite to the right performance of the work committed to his charge. There are now pastors and teachers, but their qualifications are acquired by the ordinary process of learning and experience. It would be completely foreign to Scriptural style to speak of such as "*gifts*."

The apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, thus said to be *gifted* to the church by the Lord, were given only for a time, and for the purpose of edifying the body of Christ. The time is specified thus—"Till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. Now that time has long since passed away—the church has come to the unity of the faith. When the last apostolic communication was given that unity was consummated; then the church stood forth a *perfect man*, having attained to the stature of the fulness of Christ. The perfection referred to is not that of number, not that of character, but that of faith, ordinances, and divinely appointed order; all of which were established ere the Lord suffered his apostles and prophets to leave the earth. That which is perfect having come, that which was in part was done away, and Paul names prophecy as belonging to that which would thus be removed, that faith, hope and love might remain. Eph. iv. ; 1 Cor. xiii.

As, then, we have no apostles so we have no prophets. Evangelists, pastors, and teachers there can be without supernatural gifts; they, therefore remain. Apostles and prophets cannot be, unless qualified by the gifts of the Holy Spirit; which ceased when, or soon after, "that which was perfect had come." There are those who teach that we have not now miraculous gifts, apostles and prophets, because of the unfaithfulness of the church. We shall not deny the unfaithfulness of the church, generally; but we must deny that the gifts were withdrawn on that account—on the contrary, they were given for a time, continued their full period, and then terminated because the end was answered for which they were given.

God's prophets still speak to us through the records they were led by the Spirit to compile. It is ours to learn the things they have testified and to minister them to mutual edification, knowing that now we have neither apostle nor prophet.

D. K.

THE SPEECH WHICH THE POPE SHOULD HAVE DELIVERED AT THE OPENING OF THE COUNCIL.*

VENERABLE colleagues and dear brethren,—We are unwilling to finish our career in the sovereign pontificate of the Roman Church, in which we have endured so many torments, without assuring you that we have sought after the means of remedying the disorders which afflict the Church and threaten its existence.

Events of great importance have been accomplished since our elevation to the see of Rome.

Carried away by the ardour of our heart, we at the first seconded the liberal movement which made itself felt on all sides, and which, in spite

* From a document, by PIERRE DES PILLIERS, an ex-priest, which, duly sealed and signed, has been delivered to the Pope.

of the barriers placed by our predecessors, invaded most minds in our own dominions.

However, brought to a stand in our views by a *coterie*, to which we made the mistake of yielding, we commenced a retrograde movement, and were thrown by the tempest on a foreign land. Replaced and sustained on the throne by the arms of France, we resumed the old traditions of our predecessors, and recommended them energetically to the Governments which acknowledged our authority.

Alas! dearest brethren, our counsels were not profitable to them—very far from it!

Our well-beloved son, Ferdinand II., King of Naples, afforded us regal hospitality at Gaeta,

Ten years after the hospitable city of Gaeta and the crown of that dynasty fell under the assaults of a band of adventurers, notwithstanding the valorous defence made by his worthy successor, Francis II. Another of our sons, Francis Joseph, with whom we in 1856 made a concordat, having for its object to apply to the empire of Austria the principles that prevailed in our own States, found himself on that account in conflict with his principal subjects and the representatives of the nation.

A few years after, attacked by the King of Sardinia, who was supported by the French army, the Emperor Francis Joseph lost successively, together with the battles of Magenta and Solferino, the rich provinces of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom and the strongholds of the inexpugnable Quadrilateral. In 1866, after a struggle of some weeks, in which his army was cut to pieces, he was compelled to yield a part of his dominions to Prussia.

All the princes of Italy, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, the Duchess of Parma, the Duke of Modena, who so well applied our method of government in their states, underwent one after another the same fate, being carried away by the tempest of revolution. We have scarcely the courage to recall to your minds the lamentable drama of Queretaro, in which the unfortunate Maximilian, who we thought would be a docile instrument of our views in Mexico, paid for his rash enterprise with his life, leaving his widow, the Empress Charlotte, a hopeless maniac.

Finally, we ourselves have lost more than three-fourths of our provinces, and the rest we have kept, notwithstanding the prohibition of Christ, only by employing the sword, profiting by the latest improvements made in weapons of offence, after having raised millions and millions in taxes laid on our people. From all sides we gathered together warriors to support our temporal rights, proclaiming them the legitimate rights of *St. Peter's Patrimony*, though it is true that the poor Galilean fisherman never had any patrimony but a boat and a net or two, which he joyously abandoned in order to follow the Master, who himself had not even a stone whereon to lay his head. How many thousands of men and what heaps of gold sacrificed, without any other result than to cause our rule to be cursed and the religion of Christ to be blasphemed!

All these events, dear colleagues, appeared to us at first as simple trials on the part of Providence, and in the degree in which they took place we hoped that each would be the last; that, thanks to the dogma of Mary the Immaculate, more prosperous days were about to dawn upon the Church.

ILLUSIONS! ILLUSIONS! Everything went from bad to worse.

No longer could we shield ourselves from the thought that the finger

of God showed itself in those catastrophes, and, after praying to the Lord, we felt ourselves inspired and prompted to call you around us, that we might take counsel together as to the means of saving large and varied masses of men that are ever more and more receding from Christianity and approaching the bottomless pit of infidelity.

We have begun to fear that our titles—*Bishop of bishops, Supreme Head of the Church, Common Father of Believers, Successor of Peter, and Vicar of Christ*—are so many haughty titles usurped by our predecessors with a view to universal empire.

Several great religious events have struck us:—First, the Eastern Schism, begun in the 9th century and consummated in the 11th; then the separation of the Churches of England and Scotland from that of Rome; and, lastly, the Protestant movement of the 16th century, which took from us nearly one-half of our adherents.

We were led to doubt whether the disciples who at those epochs and in lands distant one from the other combined in so large a number under their bishops or their priests to withstand the pretensions of the Roman Church, were, as was said, generally animated by a culpable spirit of rebellion against legitimate authority; and this doubt we earnestly desired to settle. For this purpose we have studied history in its original sources, casting aside the numberless prejudices with which our infancy was fed, our clerkship nourished, and our pontificate adulated. Having, then, effaced from our minds all that had been inculcated on us, without being tested by our reason, we have ascertained—first, that in the three earliest centuries the bishops of Rome were bishops in the same way as all others. In reality, St. Jerome, comparing the greatest sees—Rome, Constantinople, and Alexandria—with the inferior ones, asserts that the episcopal dignity is everywhere the same.

We have also ascertained that the jurisdictions obtained by the Apostolic Sees of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, come only from the concessions of Councils, and not from either Christ or the apostles. In 381, the first Council of Constantinople resolves that the bishop of that city shall have primacy in honour after that of Rome, *because* Constantinople is New Rome. In 451, the Council of Chalcedon, subjecting to the Patriarch of Constantinople the dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, writes to the Bishop of Rome, Leo I.:—"Honour our *judgment* by your own decrees."

The Fathers of Chalcedon, then, did not acknowledge any supremacy in our predecessor, since they had *judged* without him, and merely asked for his adhesion.

From these facts, confirmed by the most irrefragable documents, it results that the actual Papacy, which has no basis in the tradition of the eight first centuries, and still less in the Gospel, the texts of which must be wrested if you are resolved to arrive at a certain system;—from these facts, we say, it results that the actual Papacy is sacrilegious usurpation of the right of God and the whole church, and that our duty, the duty of me, Pius IX. and Bishop of Rome, is to declare to you that we abolish it simply and purely, praying God to forgive us our error, which we inherited from our fathers and from circumstances.

In consequence, venerable colleagues, you are here no longer before the supreme head of the Church; you are in presence of an equal.

From this day forward we anathematize as blasphemies the titles of HOLINESS, of VERY HOLY FATHER, etc., which have been given to us, and

we proscribe as unworthy adulation those of EMINENCE, EXCELLENCE, GREATNESS, PATERNITY, REVERENCE, etc., with their ridiculous superlatives, MOST ILLUSTRIOUS, MOST EMINENT, MOST PURE, MOST REVEREND, etc., given to cardinals, bishops, superiors in monasteries, etc.

These titles were totally unknown to Peter and Paul.

Nothing is more contrary to the Spirit of Christ than the colossal wealth amassed by the Church during fifteen centuries; and history shows by the aid of what means, each more reprehensible than the former, those riches were accumulated, to the detriment of individuals, of families, of nations; of what frauds, of what crimes they have been the source. My venerated colleagues, in order to render us all true disciples of Jesus Christ, who lived in poverty, and who bade us in our evangelical labours, "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves: for the workman is worthy of his meat." (Matt. x. 9, 10), let us sacrifice this opulence, which is not only badly acquired, but corrupting, throwing ourselves on our Master for support, in agreement with his promise, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." (Matt. vi. 33).

Here, be assured, you see the sole means for regaining the confidence of the nations of the earth, to shut the mouth of infidelity, by which we are accused of not believing in the Gospel, because we tread its maxims under our feet.

We ought even to refuse, at the hands of our respective governments, the emoluments which are forced from the people, in order not to furnish them with a pretext for complaining that the ministers of a poor Master have at heart their own material interests rather than the spiritual advantage of their flocks. Have faith in Providence, which will provide what is necessary in the spontaneous offerings of the disciples of Christ. Many just men have laid their complaints before us—priests, monks, nuns,—from whom bishops or superiors required things contrary to their conscience. Instead of taking in hand the interests of the innocent, we have generally sacrificed it to the principle of authority, which is always immoral when it has not on its own side right and truth. . . .

By the fire, flame, and sword of the Inquisition, by the establishment of the INDEX (censure and condemnation of books), by a secret police always at work, yet always defying the sharpest eyes, we have checked the noble flight of intelligence, shackled the material and moral progress of nations, heaped ruins on ruins, shed torrents of blood, turned societies and families upside down, &c. . . .

Here, well-beloved colleagues,—here is the work of religious regeneration, which we propose to you in full confidence, that, after having so exactly followed us in our errors, you will not be less eager to follow us in our return to truth. Be assured that the truth alone can save the world and ourselves; for what has Christ said? "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John viii. 32). It is not our own work that we have to do; it is the work of the Lord. Thus, then, may the day soon come when it will be true to say, "Christ Triumphs; Christ reigns; Christ rules!"

So be it!

True Catholic.

UNION PRAYER MEETINGS.*

MR. EDITOR—All hail to every effort to induce all who love the Lord to rally together and form one grand army! There are among the more advanced in knowledge of divine things those who deplore the present distracted condition of the professed people of God and who see clearly that if the world is to be overcome at all, and won to Jesus, there must be union among his people.

This conclusion is a proper one. "United we stand; divided we fall," is an old secular-union motto. It may, to a certain extent, be accepted by the Christian. I say to a certain extent, but only to a certain extent, for while there is no divine warrant that secular institutions shall last for ever, rather the reverse—they shall fall—there is positive assurance from the mouth of the Lord that his cause shall not fail. The gates of Hell shall not prevail against it—it shall never die. The extent to which I am willing to accept this oft paraded motto is this: United we are strong and fitted for great achievements in the cause of our Lord and Master, but, divided we will never be able to convert the world. This may be inferred from the prayer of Jesus, (John xvii, 21,) "That they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." That is as I understand it, the union of his people would effect the conversion of the world, while their disunion would prevent it. Every man therefore, who desires the well-being of his fellows and the glory of God in their conversion, will rejoice in every effort which has for its object the re-union of God's people, seeing that so much depends upon it.

We now invite you to a consideration of the following thoughts suggested by the words "Union Prayer Meeting." 1. Union is desired, prayed for—hence evidently there is disunion. 2. God is acknowledged as He who alone can bring about this desired union. 3. It is believed that prayer is a means whereby this object can be accomplished. Hence, "union prayer meetings."

1. Union is desired—prayed for; hence evidently there is disunion. Where there is no disunion, there could be no union prayer meetings. This is self evident. Taking it for granted then that disunion exists among believers in revelation, and seeing also, that it is a condition out of which they desire to be delivered, the question is pertinent, who has caused this deprecated state? Every heart in which is found genuine reverence for the Almighty God, will repel the thought as blasphemous, that He is to blame. In like manner will they free the blessed Jesus from the charge, and none will dare to impose it on the Holy Spirit. The God-head must be excluded from having any share in this now much lamented disunion. There was a time when men were found bold enough to defend it as a positive good—yea, even now there are those who glory in sectarianism; but generally speaking, there is now a longing desire for union among all who believe that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of men.

But who has caused this evil; Our reply is in the language of scripture, "An enemy has done this," and that enemy is the Devil—the adversary of God and man. (Read Matt. xiii. 23—40.)

We cannot but observe however, that he never could have disunited the people of God had they remained faithful to Him. Eve fell, because she yielded to the tempter, so disunion came, because they gave place to the

* This Article, from an American Secular Paper, is from the pen of C. Abercrombie.

Devil. It was in the power of Eve to resist, so also it ever has been in the power of God's people to resist the tempter. Had they used that power, they never would have had cause to pray for union.

2. God alone can bring about this desired union. The power which keeps alive disunion must be overcome, and I am satisfied the required power is with God. Are all who pray for union of this mind, that is, are all such persuaded that the power to effect union is with God? Then as a necessary preliminary to union let us cease from imagining that we can do it. That is, let us cease from thinking that we can effect it by plans of our own devising. That were to exalt our own wisdom above God's and to disbelieve that the required power is with Him. Another necessary step is that we expel from our minds the thought that union can best be effected by accepting one or other of the existing forms of ecclesiasticism. That is we must not suppose—if we ever have supposed—that the desired union will be more certainly effected by our all becoming Methodists or Baptists, and so on through the whole catalogue. So long as we may think so, we are not yielding the right to God and, therefore, just so long will the union be delayed. Let us then all leave our isms, go to God, to Him reverently bow and humbly acknowledge that our notions, our isms, have proved subversive of and opposed to union, that having discovered this, we humbly confess our sins of self-conceitedness and daring presumption, avow our sincere faith in God, submit to be guided by Him in this matter of union; and the work is done. He will use His power then, and it will be realized to be strong in the experience of those out of whose hearts has been emptied every particle of attachment to the isms that have too long kept loving hearts asunder and caused the enemy to mock.

There is power in a sword to kill, but not while it lies in its scabbard unused. It must be drawn and used. God's power is not far from us. The sword of the Lord is with us.—The keen two edged sword, so delicately keen that it can separate between Soul and Spirit. The Bible is with us. Let us use it. Let us be guided by it exclusively as by the voice of the living God. If we do so I am verily persuaded that the sun is about to rise on the union we pray for. Let each party drop his denominational badge and each believe in Jesus, be satisfied with the name worn by the early followers of the Lamb, (See Acts xi. 26) and the happy, blissful day shall have come, and the angels who sang the birth of Jesus, may be supposed to sing again that joyous song, "Glory to God in the highest; on earth peace, good will to men."

I propose that a conference of the various religious parties in the neighbourhood meet in some given place, and at a given time, to consider the causes of disunion in order to their being removed. I suggest that in this proposed examination the dictates of the Bible be reverently accepted as all sufficient to this end, though in so doing, we should have to yield up much that we may have long held in high esteem. Who among the lovers of union will accept this proposition and help it forward.

3. It is believed that prayer is a means whereby this desired union can be effected; hence "union prayer meetings." I do verily believe in prayer, and that a prayerless Christian is an anomaly as great as would be "a pure adulterer or an honest thief." But I also believe that "if we regard iniquity in our heart the Lord will not hear us." Now if in our approaches to God, in private or public, in behalf of union we retain the impression that our own particular ism is to be preferred as a basis of union to every thing else, I am bold to affirm that in so doing we regard that which is

wrong; iniquity in our heart; and therefore cannot expect the blessing of God. Has He not said "He will not hear?" Let us each subject our spiritual state to careful examination in the fear of God, critically consider on what we have based our faith—how far we are solicitous that all things should be in accordance with His will as expressed in the Bible—how far we are willing to be led by the Holy Spirit speaking by His word, and if we find our hearts set loose to all but his will, then rejoice, for union is near. We shall then be all prepared to pledge ourselves to such a proposition as the following: "Where the scriptures speak we speak, and where the scriptures are silent we are silent."

There is a basis of union—only one. If we all consent to build thereon—

Then party sects and names shall fall,
And Jesus Christ be all in all.

CHRISTIANUS.

CONVENTIONAL STUDY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

I cannot but attribute a great part of the discrepancy and perplexing uncertainty that has arisen, both on this and on several other points, to the habit cherished by some persons of READING THE SCRIPTURES—assiduously indeed—but without any attentive reflection, and studious endeavour to ascertain the real sense of what they read; concluding that whatever impression is found to be left on the mind after a bare perusal of the words, must be what the sacred writers designed. They use, in short, little or none of that care which is employed on any other subject in which we are much interested—to read through each treatise consecutively as a whole; to compare one passage with others, that may throw light on it; and to consider what was the general drift of the author, and what were the occasions and the person he had in view.

In fact, the real *students* of Scripture, properly so called, are, I fear, fewer than is commonly supposed. The theological student is often a student chiefly of some human system of divinity, fortified by *references* to Scripture, introduced from time to time as there is occasion. He proceeds—often unconsciously—by setting himself to ascertain, not, what is the information or instruction to be derived from a certain narrative or discourse of one of the sacred writers, but what aid can be derived from them towards establishing or refuting this or that point of dogmatic theology. Such a mode of study surely ought at least not to be exclusively pursued. At any rate it cannot properly be called a *study of Scripture*.

There is, in fact, a danger of its proving a great *hindrance* to the profitable study of Scripture. For so strong an association is apt to be established in the mind between certain expressions and the *technical* sense to which they have been confined in some theological system, that when the student meets with them in Scripture, he at once understands them in that sense, in passages where perhaps an unbiassed examination of the context would plainly show that such was not the author's meaning. And such a student one may often find expressing the most unfeigned wonder at the blindness of those who cannot find in Scripture such and such doctrines, which appear to him to be as clearly set forth there as words can express; which perhaps they are, on the (often gratuitous) *supposition*, that those words are every where to be understood exactly in the sense which he has previously derived from some human system—a system through which, as through a discoloured medium, he views Scripture. But this is not to take Scripture for one's guide, but rather to make one's self a *guide* to Scripture.—*Whately*.

MAN'S THOUGHTS AND GOD'S THOUGHTS.

In the prophetic record it is declared by none other than Jehovah himself, that his thoughts are higher than man's thoughts, as much as the heavens are higher than the earth. No where is the truthfulness of this statement more fully illustrated than in the difference between the answer which the Shorter Catechism gives to the question, "*Did God leave all mankind to perish in the estate of sin and misery?*" and the answer which Jesus gives in his conversation with the Rabbi of the Jews. Here are

MAN'S THOUGHTS.

"*Did God leave all mankind to perish in the estate of sin and misery?*" *Answer.* "God having, out of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace, to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring them into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer." (Shorter Catechism, question 20.)

GOD'S THOUGHTS.

"*Did God leave all mankind to perish in the estate of sin and misery?*" *Answer.* "God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John iii. 16.)

What a great disparity there is between the former and the latter answer! The former is narrow, one-sided, and man-like; the latter is wide, all-embracing, and divine. What man calls "mere good pleasure," Jesus declares is "love." Those who are loved by God, man says, are only the "elected some," while Jesus declares they are "the world." The blessings which God has provided and brought near to sinners are only for the benefit of the eternally chosen, says the orthodox divine. They are to "whosoever believeth," says the Son of God. They are therefore to you, O man, whosoever you are. All that is wrapt up in Jesus, with Jesus himself, is God's gift to you. He presses it on you, that ye might not perish but have eternal life.—*Forward.*

THE DOCTRINE OF BALAAM.

"But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam." Thus spoke the Spirit to the Church in Pergamos. It has been a matter of dispute what was intended by "the doctrine of Balaam," as indeed the whole character and history of the man, as given to us, is puzzling. It was unquestionably a very bad doctrine, and a doctrine that was apt to repeat itself, as bad doctrines generally do.

When we examine the history of Balaam, it is difficult to find any thing in his doctrine that could deserve this reprobation. When the messengers from Balak came to him to engage him to curse Israel, he would give them no answer until he enquired of the Lord. When the Lord said to him, "Thou shalt not go with them; thou shalt not curse the people for they are blessed;" he acquiesced in the decision and refused to go. When they returned with large offers of reward to induce him to go, he answered, "If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I can not go beyond the word of the Lord my God, to do less or more." This certainly, is very good doctrine. True, his integrity seemed somewhat shaky when he enquired a *second time* of the Lord, as if the first answer was not sufficient. It looks like an anxiety to get another sort of answer; and

when any one who understands clearly the will of God, is prompted by his selfish interests *to try to understand it some other way*, he is very apt to get an answer to suit him, and to become the victim of his own delusions. Thus Balaam got an answer to suit him the second time, and went to Balak. Still, there is nothing in any "doctrine" taught by him that is bad. That he was in eager haste to obtain the rewards of unrighteousness, we are plainly told; and that the angel of God, who met him by the way admonished him of his madness—causing even a dumb brute to reprove him for his blind haste—we are fully informed. But in all, Balaam scrupulously adheres to the letter of his permission, and teaches no false doctrine.

Nor can he be said to assert any false doctrine in the magnificent utterances extorted from him in the high places of Baal; for whatever he may have desired to say, he spoke only words of blessing on Israel. He found no divination against Jacob, no enchantment against Israel. "Behold, I have received commandment to bless, and he hath blessed, and I cannot reverse it." Every succeeding trial but enlarges the blessing and increases the glory of the chosen people of God. "And Balaam rose up, and went and returned to his place; and Balak also went his way." In all this we discover no bad doctrine.

The text we quoted at the beginning (Rev. ii. 14), gives us the best insight into this bad doctrine. He "taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication." Balaam saw that as long as the tribes of Israel "dwelt alone," and were not "reckoned among the nations," there was no divination against them. Beholding them all encamped according to the divine commandment, he was constrained to cry out. "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel!" But it appears that this crafty man, before he left for his own land, put Balak on a plan to accomplish his purpose. He taught the king to cease hostilities, and *assume the mask of friendship*; to invite the Israelites to his idolatrous feasts, and entice them with the daughters of Moab. Once persuaded to abandon their separate character, and to join in the festive rites of idolaters, God would curse them, and it would need no army to destroy them. Hence, Moses intimates that, "*through the counsel of Balaam*," Balak caused the children of Israel to commit trespass against the Lord (Numb. xxxi. 16). Israel, lured by these friendly demonstrations, joined himself to Baal-peor, and ate the sacrifices of the dead; and four and twenty thousand fell down dead because of transgression.

This shows Balaam to have been a man of craft. His doctrine was the *doctrine of compromise*. "You can not conquer them in open fight," said Balaam. "God has called them to be a separate people, and as long as they are true to their calling, they are invincible. Enter into a compromise with them. Lure them, through blandishments, from their steadfastness; entice them by friendly demonstrations into a surrender of their integrity, and their ruin is accomplished."

Thus was Israel led on to a betrayal of trust under the silken guise of friendship which the enemy assumed. They could not be *driven* to ruin, but they might be lured, by meretricious arts, into a fatal snare. The sequel is sad and awful.

Have we no Balaamites now? It strikes us that the "doctrine of Balaam" is quite popular just now. Christians are called to be a "peculiar people;" as a Church, they are separated from the world to a distinct work. Their invincibility is in their loyalty to the principles of the new life. They are

in direct and positive antagonism to the world, the flesh, and the devil. They have ever been triumphant when true to their principles. The world in arms can not subdue them. No Balaam can curse them. But the world *in the guise of friendship*, luring them into a compromise of their principles, and drawing them into sympathy with the pleasures and pursuits of the ungodly, can work their ruin. "The friendship of the world is enmity against God." The Church is in more peril to-day from the friendship of the world, than she ever was in the darkest days, when "the heathen raged and the people imagined vain things;" when the kings and rulers of earth took counsel against her.

Forewarned is forearmed. We wish to lift a warning voice. The generation that initiated this movement for the restoration of primitive Christianity, is rapidly passing away. A generation is rising up that knows little of their toils and sacrifices. A cause that is already lifted into the sunshine of prosperity, and delivered from reproach, is, in many communities, called to experience a new kind of trial. It has conquered the *oppositions* of the world—can it likewise conquer its *smiles*? As riches increase, and numbers enlarge, and the world seeks alliance with a growing Church, and our membership is exposed to constant temptations growing out of this change of circumstances, will the Church conquer the world by its holiness and zeal, or will the world conquer the Church by its sensuous and sensual attractions? The ball-room, the card-table, the theatre, are spreading their blandishments; political and commercial life are unsealing their fountains of corruption; the mad idolatries of pleasure and of gain are steadily luring us; pride, luxury, and a thousand forms of carnal indulgence are emasculating the sturdy faith and heroic self-sacrifice that achieved the successes of the past. Shall the Church still be a chaste virgin, arrayed in the "fine linen, clean and white," of spiritual purity; or be covered with the gaudy ornaments, and meretricious glare of the world's harlotries? Shall Israel dwell alone, or be joined to Baal-peor? Take care!

Christian Standard.

BY AND BYE.

BY AND BY. Almost the first glowing promise of an indefinite "good time coming," is found in these words addressed to the childish mind as soon as it can comprehend the meaning of language. As soon as the little feet of children press the hard road of life before them, its dim perspective joys and rewards open in rich profusion—bright attainments and golden hours are to be theirs by and bye. Step by step the tender feet patter along the way, and the toy, the bird, is almost theirs; will be, by and bye.

Steadier grow the footsteps. The future now holds more substantial enjoyments; day after day brings them nearer, and youth can tell the thrill of delight the heart feels at the prospect of so much, so soon, just by and bye.

The boy is a man, and before him how fair the picture. He can almost see the home that love will make an Eden. He can picture the wife whose gentle words and cheerful ways are to bring and keep the sunlight there. He can imagine the fond greeting after the toils of the day—O, he has lived it over a thousand times. Hasn't the maiden built and rebuilt the fair air-castles? Isn't "he whom her soul loves" just the best, and dearest, and truest of men, and isn't a charm'd life to be theirs by and

bye? Don't sneer at it. If the world has hardened and roughened you, it doesn't follow that there never was a time when things had a rosy hue. The fields may all be turning brown now, but they were fresh once, and there was a time, long ago, may be, "when you looked forward to by and bye with glowing anticipations.

'Tisn't only the children, you know, who keep looking for "a good time coming." We are all only big children, and if it wasn't that Mrs. Grundy gives us such sharp pokes, some of us would always be children.

Some people drop their youth as if it were infected with the small-pox; while their visage and deportment would lead one to suppose that rue and sage were all the herbs that *Materia Medica* employed—so excessive their wisdom, so bitter their speech. After all they are only grown up children.

Others cling to youth with a death-grip, presenting another extreme; for despite juvenile airs, "crow's feet" and gray hairs will have your attention.

Other some grow beautifully—it is almost impossible to tell their age—in fact, you seldom think of it, for all the freshness of youth and the sobriety of maturer life mingle, and you "just love them." But you think I am digressing—perhaps so; but I was thinking that the difference between these people is owing to the way they look at by and bye. The last are looking ever into a fair future; if the earth does not hold it, heaven does. It is not only in this life that they have hope in Christ; and so they quickly turn to that blessed rest remaining, and though the way may be rough, the star of peace has arisen for them and they keep it in view. It matters little to them that their

"Frail boat is tossed and battered,
With its sails all torn and wet,
Crossing still a waste of waters,
Over which the sun has set."

They are not looking backward, but forward, and the light from the other shore is all in all to them.

"After all I enjoy life," said one who had tasted many an apple of Sodom. Yes, "after all;" because the light of by and bye was ever radiating around, and the hopeful soul gathers new strength day by day to meet the trials of the way. Take courage, failing one.

"Are the eyelids very weary?
Does the tired head long for rest?
Are the temples hot and throbbing?
Are the hands together prest?"

Struggle on! there is a by and bye for you—there, if never here. A time when all the knotty threads will be straightened, and the warp of life show plainly its colouring. I think often of those happy souls, pointed out to the Revelator, who had "come up through great tribulation." No little cross had been theirs, no light affliction, but with strong waves and billows they had struggled till at last their boats lay at anchor in the port of peace and final deliverance.

Job, looking in the utter desolation of his life at a time when wealth, health and friends were gone, when bereaved of his children, when even his wife turned from him, said, though he knew not why the Lord had dealt thus—"When He hath tried me I shall come forth as gold." Don't you see that the sweetness of by and bye was mingling even with that bitter cup. "When He hath tried me"—yes, after the strife he was looking for a peaceful by and bye.

When you and I have laid aside this mortal, when the crooked has been made straight, when we stand where we shall know as we are known: then, and not till then, shall we cease looking for the dawning of better days by and bye.

MARY BITTLE.

Reviews, Notes, Passing Events, &c.

THE MAN OF SIN IDENTIFIED: DEMONSTRATING, THAT HE NOW SITS IN THE TEMPLE OF THE GOD AND THAT THE THEORY OF A MONO-PERSONAL ANTI-CHRIST, YET TO COME, IS PURE FICTION. By *David King*.

WHAT the author claims to have accomplished may be gathered from the title of this pamphlet, together with the following from his first pages.

The Reformers of the Sixteenth Century found, in the above description of the Man of Sin, a telling weapon against their papal adversaries. There can be no doubt that thousands were thereby enabled to identify the Papacy as that opposer of Christ and the Church which Paul foretold would gain place and power by the removal of the Hinderer.

The Church of Rome, of course, does not receive this generally-accepted protestant application of the words of Paul. She insists, that the Man of Sin is not yet revealed; that a single person is referred to, identical with the Antichrist of John; that three years and a half is the term of his continuance; and, that, denying both the Father and the Son, he cannot be Christian even in profession.

So futile has the writer of these pages considered the Romish application of the Apostle's prediction, that in the course of more than a quarter of a century of controversial writing and speaking he has not deemed it worth public notice—a case so weak, presented by parties so interested, did not demand serious attention. But Romanists have the good fortune to get their work largely done by Protestants, without cost, and better than they can do it themselves. Their priestly assumption, confessional, and mass, are propagated more effectually by our State-church than by their own direct agency. In like manner, their efforts to evade the most crushing description, which the Holy Spirit has recorded against them, is rendered more effective than they could possibly make them by a section of Millenarian Protestants, who deny its application to the Papacy; affirm that the Man of Sin is yet to come; point to the present Emperor of the French as destined to fill the outline; or predict, for that purpose, the resurrec-

tion of the First Napoleon or that of Judas Iscariot.

It must not, however, be supposed that these new defenders of the Papal interpretation have made discoveries which add strength to that interpretation. Nothing of the sort! They adopt it because they *need* it. They present it in its old weakness. It is only more misleading in their hands than in those of the Romanist, because they are not regarded as alike interested in its defence. It is certainly to be deeply regretted that Christians and Protestants have their hands thus weakened against the worst foe of the Church by men in their own ranks. But thus it must be till re-assertion of truth and refutation of crudities clear the ground. But for this the present writing would not have been undertaken. As it is, the writer will be disappointed if his work terminate without proving that the MAN OF SIN is already revealed in the PAPAL INSTITUTION. Millenarians admit the similarity, in many particulars, as truly remarkable. But with the writer such admission will not suffice. He finds in the Papacy every feature of the outline given by the Apostle: so that we have not merely "remarkable similarity," but actual identity. This conclusion is come to after due study of the arguments from the other side and with the strongest opposing statements fully in view.

That the reader may be fairly in possession of the ground taken by the generality of those who insist that the Man of Sin is not yet revealed, the arguments upon which they usually rely shall be first set forth:—nothing deemed by the writer of sufficient force to warrant notice shall be excluded. It is believed that the following will be accepted as a somewhat full and perfectly fair statement of the ground they take:—

Then follow some nine distinct arguments against the generally-received Protestant interpretation of Paul's description of the Man of Sin. These arguments are pre-

sented, pretty generally, in the words of those who contend that the revelation of the Man of Sin has not yet taken place, but that an incarnation of Satan, in some one man, will yet fill the outline.

The manner in which the author deals out his arguments may be gathered from the following :—

"Who opposes : and exalts himself above all that is called God." The rendering of the Common Version in this clause is well enough if only an additional point be introduced. To oppose himself above every one called God, at once strikes the ear as faulty in expression. We may very well say, "exalt himself above," but to "oppose himself above" commends not itself to any one. DEAN ALFORD reads, "He that withstands; and exalts himself above every one that is called God," and he justly intimates that the construction must not be carried on so that the withstanding is applied to the "every one that is called God"—self-exaltation over them is affirmed, but the *withstanding* is not thus applied.

WICKLIFFE reads—"The son of perdition that is adversarie." So also the versions of *Rheims* and *Geneva*, and that of *Cranmer*.

The *Man of Sin* is thus described as *Adversary, Opposer, Withstander*; not of the many gods which men have created, but of the Gospel, Church, Christ, and God, as made known by the apostles of Jesus. The *opposition* affirmed is, then, *against* God, while the *exaltation* is *above* or *over* every one that is called God. This agrees with a statement by Daniel, evidently referring to the same withstander. "He shall speak great swelling words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws." Daniel vii. The "He," foretold as doing this, is certainly not *one man*, but a kingly power, as existing in a kingdom with its succession of kings or rulers. In Dan. xi. the distinction between the many gods and the *One True God* (in this matter of a presumptuous power *opposing* and *exalting himself*) is thus expressed—"And the king shall do according to his will, and he shall *exalt* himself, and shall magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of Gods." Here, then, exalting himself *above* every god does not include Jehovah; *against* whom, however, by marvellous speaking, he does oppose himself. Under the influence of due reverence the prophet refused to jumble up the *One True God* with the multitude of false gods; and no doubt the apostle,

writing by the same spirit, marks the same distinction. He, then, gives us to know, that "The Man of Sin" is an Adversary to the True God and that he exalts himself *over* or *upon* every one of the numerous objects of worship, set up by men; whether departed heroes, kings, magistrates, or other idols. It, then, follows, that in order to identify the *Man of Sin* it is not needful to find one who exalts himself above the true God. If there be found man or system which is exalted above the king-gods and false deities of the world, so as to make them subordinate to his purpose and inferior to the power he claims, then we have all the self-exaltation *expressed* by the apostle. It may be that the *Man of Sin* has gone, or may yet go, so far beyond this as to exalt himself above the only true God (the writer believes he *has*), but that is not directly stated in the indictment and its not being realized would not make against the identification.

But how far does the Papacy answer this description? It opposes *God, Christ, and Christianity*; not occasionally and in the persons of bad samples of Romanists merely, but persistently, and the more so as its members are accordant with their principles. GOD is OPPOSED; inasmuch as things commanded by Him are forbidden and others, forbidden by Him, commanded. CHRIST is OPPOSED: He declares His one offering for sins for ever sufficient; but men, assuming priesthood (where He has abolished priestly office), insist upon offering continually the sacrifice of the mass. THE GOSPEL is OPPOSED; for another gospel is substituted, whereby sins are put away on the ground of the superfluous merit of better sinners; and permission to sin is sold at a fixed scale of prices. Besides which the gospel and the whole of apostolic truth contained in the Bible is prohibited to the people, wherever its circulation can be safely forbidden. The CHURCH OF CHRIST is OPPOSED; for confiscation, torture, and death, are the award of Rome, to those who dare worship according to the faith and order of the First Churches. Pre-eminently, then, and according to its own declared principles, is the Roman Church the OPPOSER, the ADVERSARY of God, of Christ, of Christianity, and of the Church! So far as this feature is concerned, no power, person, or system, past or future, can possibly answer more fully to the words of the apostles—"WHO OPPOSES."

"And exalts himself above all that is called God; or an object of worship." It has already been seen that in view of the usage of the time in applying the word "God" to kings, departed heroes, &c., there is no need to understand the apostle as including

the only living and true God. To find the Man of Sin we have need only to look for one who exalts himself *upon*, or above, kings and rulers generally and who assumes more than was claimed for the deified heroes and idols set up for adoration. In the Papacy this is surely and completely done. There is no need to stretch a point to make the fulfilment perfect; the evidence is abundant. As to the exaltation of the Pope above the civil ruler—Emperors, Kings, Magistrates, &c.—the canon law says, that “there is as great a difference between the Popes and the Kings as there is between the sun and the moon. History shows how these Papal pretensions were practically asserted. ORTO received his crown as a Papal grant. CHARLEMAGNE received his title of Emperor as a gift from the Pope. KING HENRY II., before he invaded Ireland obtained permission of the Pope, as the *supreme sovereign of every professedly Christian country*. The Pope issued a bull, granting to PRINCE HENRY of Portugal the sovereignty over every country which the Portuguese could discover in America; because he (the Pope) was appointed ‘to reign from sea to sea, and from the river to the end of the earth!’ LOUIS II., and the Emperor FREDERICK BARBAROSSA, acknowledged their inferiority by holding the bridle of the horse upon which Pope Nicholas rode. Pope Celestine kicked the crown off the head of the Emperor HENRY VI. Pope Pius V., excommunicated QUEEN ELIZABETH, and absolved her subjects from their oath of allegiance.” These are but a sample of the deeds by which the power of the Popes has been manifested, but they are more than enough to show that he exalts himself above the kings of the earth; to whom, in the days of the apostles, the term *God* was applied. But does he also exalt himself above the gods and demigods, the departed heroes and other man-made objects of worship? Certainly he does! He who claims to have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth; who enters into the domain of conscience and decrees death to those who think not as he wills; who makes pardon for sin and deliverance from eternal fire depend upon the acts and intentions of his subordinates; who forgives sins before they are committed: or, in other words, dispenses a license to sin; and who creates objects of worship, at his own pleasure, and in direct opposition to the revealed will of God, whom he professes to reverence, does, most certainly, thereby exalt himself far above the objects of worship by which the apostle was surrounded in the heathen world. What *maginary* god has received

such adoration as the Virgin Mary? And which of them has had ascribed to it more power? But who made the mother of our Lord an object of worship? From whence do the saints of the Roman calendar receive their right to adoration? Not from God! Not from the Bible! “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve” is the declaration of Holy Writ. They are elevated to the position of objects of worship *by the Pope’s canonization*. He claims the power to decide who are saints and, having thus usurped God’s prerogative, sets up whom he will, for the adoration of future generations and in defiance of God’s own prohibition. So the authority of this Pope-god extends not only to the “ends of the earth,” but into heaven itself. Nor will it do to deny, that the saints are objects of worship, as Romanists in Protestant countries often do. When Dr. Doyle (Romanist) was examined by the Commissioners of Education it came out that in the Pope’s bull, incorporating a certain society, this passage is found—“An indulgence of three hundred days is granted for ever, to all those who, with a devout and contrite heart, repeat the three following verses of ejaculatory prayers—*Jesus, Mary and Joseph* assist me in my last agony. *Jesus, Mary, and Joseph*, I offer you my heart and soul. *Jesus, Mary and Joseph*, I breathe forth my soul to you in peace.” Here the same honor, prayer and worship are given to Mary and to Joseph as to Jesus; and the heart and soul of the worshipper are equally presented to each.

But the most appalling proof of the gross idolatry of the Papacy is in “the Psalter of the Blessed Virgin.” Such as

The Popes then are the makers of objects of worship and, therefore, greater than the gods they create. True, in words, they proclaim themselves inferior; but, as such objects of worship do not exist otherwise than by their decrees, by their works they show themselves as superior to them as the *Creator* is to the *creature*.

Dean Alford and others insist upon the impossibility, on the part of those who adore saints and angels, of exalting themselves above all that is worshipped, for, they ask, if they adore them how can they axalt themselves above them? But the very thing which it is said cannot be done has been done. Caligula, Caius Cæsar did both. He worshipped the gods and exalted himself above them. He claimed divine honors and erected a temple to his own divinity. He built out part of his palace as far as the Forum, and so continued it that the temple of Castor and Pollux seemed to be no more than the portico to his imperial mansion.

He would frequently show himself in the midst of his brother deities to be adored, and some saluted him by the name of Jupiter. Yet while he exhibited himself as divine, he offered at the shrine of the gods. *Josephus* Ant. xix.

Antiochus Epiphanes declared himself god and yet worshipped another god or gods. He impressed the name *θεος* (god) upon his coins. He spoke against the God of Gods and fixed what gods should be worshipped. Thus while he was a worshipper of the gods he exalted himself above them.

Turning to the Book of Daniel we have also a case in point "And the King shall do according to his will: and he shall exalt himself and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of Gods. Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any god; for he shall magnify himself above all. But in his estate shall he honor the God of forces, and a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honor with gold and silver, &c." "Thus shall he do in the most strong-holds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory," Dan. xi. So then this Man of Sin, which some consider to be the same as described by Paul, is represented as doing exactly what it is said the Popes cannot do—exalt themselves over all called god and yet worship some god or gods.

In this particular, then, we behold the outline completely filled.

In saying that the language of Paul does not require us to understand that the Man of Sin exalts himself above the Supreme God and shows himself as the one and only god, the writer must not be understood as taking the lower ground in order to get free from a difficulty which the more inclusive acceptance would involve him in. He takes the lower application *because* the words do not *necessarily* include more, and because no one can know that more is intended. But so far is he from needing to take this ground, from any difficulty imposed by the more expanded interpretation, that he here insists that the man of Sin, as revealed in the Papacy, has really exalted himself above the One God and Father and above the One Lord and Saviour—that he sits in his temple *showing* himself as God Supreme."

The entire ground gone over is intimated by the following recapitulation.

"Thus has been brought under notice the leading features of the Man of Sin as described by Paul, and in every particular the counter-part is found in the Papacy; not one line of the entire portraiture lacks

fulfilment. But it may be needful to enquire how the nine opposing arguments are affected by the examination of the apostle's outline, now completed. The writer claims that they are entirely refuted. The *first* affirms, that the Man of Sin is, of necessity, one person only. It has been seen that no such necessity exists, save in the mind of the objector.

The *second* attributes to the Man of Sin the characteristics of the Antichrist (given by the Apostle John) and insists, that, therefore, he must deny that Jesus Christ came in the flesh, which the Papacy does not deny. It has been shown, that there is no warrant for applying to the Man of Sin John's description of the Antichrist; and that *the* Antichrist is not *one* individual who is to come; but *many*, who were living when John wrote.

The *third* sets forth, that the Popes are not the Man of Sin, because they do not oppose themselves to every object of worship. It has been made clear that he is not said so to do—that he is the one who *opposes*, but that the opposing is not carried on to the many objects of worship.

The *fourth* intimates, that the Popes are not the Man of Sin, because they do not exalt themselves as in nature, superior to all gods, the true God and the Christ included. This has been answered by showing that nothing is said about exalting himself *as in nature* and that the apostle does not so irreverently associate the true God and the many false gods as to lump them together in the phrase, "above all that is CALLED God."

The *fifth* asserts that the Popes cannot fill the outline, because they do not sit in the true Church nor in the temple in Jerusalem. It is answered that the text does not necessarily imply that the temple is that of the true God, but may mean the temple of "*the* God," who sits therein; and that if it were otherwise, the designation could be carried on and applied, in view of what the false church had once been; and, further, that the Millenarian imaginary Man of Sin could not sit in the true Church; nor could he in the Temple of God in Jerusalem, for that has ceased to exist and, if rebuilt, would not be His temple.

The *sixth* urges that the Papacy cannot be intended, because the Popes maintain the obligations of certain laws. It is shown in reply, that the term "*Lawless One*" does not imply an avowed rejection of every law, divine and human; and abundant evidence is given to prove the Popes *lawless* in the highest degree.

The *seventh* alleges that he who comes short of possessing *all* power cannot be the

Man of Sin. It is answered that no *Creature* ever did, nor ever can, possess *all* power; that the power of the Papacy fully comes up to all that the phrase can possibly have been used to express.

The *eighth* insists, that if the Popes are alluded to all Roman Catholics must be eternally lost, whereas some will no doubt be saved. It is pointed out that the promised condemnation extends only to a certain class—those who do not love the truth but love the unrighteousness.

The *ninth* assumes that the Popes do not show themselves as the true God and, therefore, are not referred to. It is proved that they actually put themselves into the very seat of God, and assume to do what He only has power to do; that thus they *show* themselves to be God, which does not necessarily imply an avowal, in words, of supreme Godhead.

The exposition, then, covers the entire ground occupied by the objections and refutes them in every particular. The result is that the Man of Sin is identified and there is no room to fear the resurrection of Judas nor that of Napoleon. Nor need we dread the deification of the present Emperor of the French. The expectation of any one of these appearing in the future as the Man of Sin, belongs to the region of dreamland. The Man of Sin is known. He is now sitting as God, in the temple of the God, ready to declare as dogma, to be disbelieved on pain of damnation, his own infallibility.

For the filling up of the foregoing outline the reader must consult the pamphlet.

LECTURES BY THE EDITOR.

IN response to urgent requests from a committee, comprised of gentlemen of the leading denominations, the Editor of the *B. H.* consented to defend the Christian faith in Bury, where Bradlaugh, Holyoake, and others had brought their weapons to bear against the religion of Christ. The following placard brought together a mass of attentive hearers in the large Hall of the Co-operative Association:—

Four Lectures will (D.V.) be delivered in the Co-operative Hall, Bury, by David King, Evangelist and Editor of the *British Harbinger*, as follows:—Monday Evening, March 7th—Subject, "Good and Evil—the Criminality and Ultimate Utility of Sin;" chair to be taken by Rev. W. Roseman. Tuesday Evening, March 8th—Subject, "The House that God Built, and the one He is now Building;" chairman, Rev. George Scott, D.D. Wednesday Evening, March 9th—Subject, "Infidelity Refuted by Infidels;" chairman, Rev. James Webb. Thursday Evening, March 10th—Subject, "Secularism—its Moral Basis and Results;" chairman, Rev. E. Browning. The chair to be taken each evening at eight o'clock. Discussion allowed after each Lecture, subject to the discretion of the Chairman.

Both the *Bury Guardian* and the *Bury Express* report the lectures in considerable length. The *Express* devotes to three of the lectures over seven columns, reserving the fourth

lecture for its next issue. The *Guardian* fills an equal space. The *Express* intimates that the Hall was well filled with a respectable and attentive audience; that Mr. King throughout was "clear, logical, and impressive; that his sound argumentative points, lucidly demonstrated, were received with hearty applause"—that the Rev. W. Roseman took the chair, supported by the Revs. T. Howarth, E. Browning, R. Webb, H. Ouston, A. White, and by a number of other gentlemen. The *Guardian* says, "The lectures were of a very interesting character. Mr. King's style of oratory is well fitted to the all-important themes of which he treats, being clear, logical, and generally dispassionate. The audiences were numerous, and discussion was allowed after each lecture. The Rev. Dr. Scott proposed a vote of thanks to Mr. King for his able course of lectures, which was seconded by the Rev. J. H. Ouston, and carried by acclamation. A similar compliment was paid to the four chairmen."

It is but just to say that while congratulations poured in from numerous classes of Believers in the Bible, Secularists were dispirited and

savage. Though they had two men present, who are marked out in the Infidel paper as Secularist Missionaries, they scarcely ventured to touch the subject on the first and second evenings; and on the other two their opposition was evidently waged because they could not afford to allow silence to proclaim them defeated. One of them urged his friends not to say anything, but to wait till Mr. Bradlaugh could be brought to set things right.

It was regretted that Mr. King's engagements to preach in Southport and Wigan compelled him at once to leave the town, and thus refuse earnest applications to occupy pulpits in the neighbourhood. Only one of the several invitations further to enlarge upon the things of the Kingdom was he able to accept—that of addressing the students of the Baptist College; which at the request of their esteemed President, Prof. Dowson, supported by their own earnest desire, he did on the Friday morning.

The first lecture grappled with the world's great mystery; which the Bible alone unfolds. Many people earnestly desire its publication. The following outline from the *Guardian* will serve to indicate the line of argument, but entirely fails to present the consecutive reasoning and illustrations by which the subject was brought home to the hearers:—

Mr. King said a friend of his was waited upon one day by a conscientious sceptic who asked him why God permitted moral evil, and went on to say that the Bible showed God as infinitely good, wise, and powerful, and that if He were infinitely wise He could have devised a scheme to prevent evil and suffering; if infinitely good He would have desired to do it; and if infinitely powerful He would have been able to carry out the plan He had devised; and this being so why had He not done it? His (the lecturer's) friend answered that he would explain God's cure for sin, His remedy for evil, and point out how he and all sinners might be saved.

Now, that was not satisfactory, for the man was entitled to an answer, and the answer was clearly to be found in the Bible. But the question thus presented had led him (the lecturer) to consider the subject at large, and in endeavouring to answer it he would state a few propositions as briefly as possible. First he noted that sin or moral evil existed all over the world—wherever they found men they found wrong, sin, moral evil. Next, he wanted them to note that sin was not a lesser good, but a malignant and deadly thing which God and good men hate. He wished to have the stamp of deepest reprobation placed upon it at the outset. Again, sin was not always; nor would it continue for ever. It was not always. Their secular friends did not admit anything like innate or natural depravity. The man must have been in the world before the sinner, for sin was simply the transgression of the law. Therefore sin was not always, and, he added, it would not always continue. But the objector said "We admit the former part of the declaration but not the latter." He (the lecturer) could not prove from nature that sin would not always continue; he was speaking then of sin as it appeared in the Bible, and, according to God's scheme, sin simply came in for a time, and the time would come when it would cease, and we should have a glorified race without sin, sorrow, suffering, or death. The next point was that sin was not of God's creation. He created man and man became a sinner. He looked on all His work of creation and saw it to be very good. Man was before Him, able to stand, but free to fall. He could obey or he could disobey and take the consequences of his disobedience. Again, God never sanctioned sin. He merely suffered it; their was a broad distinction. Sin was the result of man's free agency. Their opponents sought to degrade man into a machine like a watch or locomotive—so long as every spring was in order the wheels would just accomplish the purpose for which they were intended. They said a man just did what he was compelled to, that he was wholly a creature of circumstances, that he could not do other than he did; and this amounted to a declaration that he was not amenable to blame, even if he were a liar, a thief, or a murderer. Their opponents, however, never acted upon the conclusion which logically followed from that argument. They did praise and blame. Mr. Bradlaugh very much blamed his opponents and intimated that he should very likely punish him, (the speaker) for something he said about secularism; and yet forsooth men were simply necessitated to do what they did. If he (Mr. King

could not do other than treat Mr. Bradlaugh as he did treat him, why in the world should he want to punish him for doing it? (Here and applause.) Mr. Holyoake stood in precisely the same position. In one of his discussions he was reminded of the case of one of Zeno's slaves. Zeno was a necessitarian, and his slaves knew that their master taught that all human actions were compelled. A slave, caught stealing some of his master's property, pleaded that he couldn't help it; he was predestined to steal the things. "You were," said Zeno, "but I was predestined to have you soundly flogged for doing it." (Laughter.) What was Mr. Holyoake's comment upon this case? He said, "It served him right." But why did it serve him right if he were compelled to do what he did? (Hear, hear.) The philosophy of their friends broke down when they came to apply it. There was not a man of the party who would attempt to carry out his own principles. They go about blaming everybody, at the same time they teach that no one is a free agent, subject to praise or blame; thereby destroying all distinction between vice and virtue. (Cheers.) The breaking out of sin in the world was not a failure in the working of God's plan, because the Bible spoke of Christ as a sacrifice for sin, as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, and declared him to have been slain from the foundation of the world; that meant, that in the Divine intention the sacrifice for sin was provided before man was created. In suffering sin God had either a good or a bad purpose or none at all. Which was it? When a man acts without a purpose we begin to think about a lunatic asylum for him. We could not think that God suffered sin without a reason. He did it for a reason, good or bad. If God suffered it for a good purpose, depend upon it that purpose would be realised. He could afford to wait. It took a long time for the acorn to become an oak. It took a very long time indeed to bring this earth into that condition in which it was when man first trod its surface. Those creative days were vast epochs, and the age of man on earth was as nothing compared with them. Between the writing of the earliest book of the old Testament and the last of the New, a vast period of time elapsed. It took a long time to prepare that book which was to work out the salvation of our race. God was not in a hurry; it was not needful that He should be; and although it might please Him, for gracious and wise purposes, to suffer a night of evil, long and dark, yet if He suffer it for a good purpose, depend on it, in the end, that purpose will be realised and God will have the victory over evil. (Applause) God suffered

sin with a view to its ultimate utility, and in this manifested the greatness of His love by suffering that to exist without which the gift of Christ would have been unnecessary. It was in view of His determination to suffer sin to exist that the plan of redemption was devised. We might be met by the objection that if God suffered sin because He would and could bring some great and blessed result out of it, sin could not be the abominable thing which it was said to be, but ought to be looked at with some degree of toleration, for a man might say, "if God can and will bring good out of evil, by sinning I am simply helping Him to work out His great purposes of good." He answered that by a simple illustration. Suppose he found his dearly loved children dying around him year after year. An enemy, who should have been a friend, burnt down his house, and he and his wife escaping with their lives were compelled to build another dwelling. After their removal they had to follow no more children to the grave. The old house was ill drained, ill ventilated, and the cause of disease in the children; but the new house was well appointed in these particulars, and where they had disease they had health, and where they had death they had life. Suppose that he told a neighbour that despite the loss of the old building he thanked God that it was destroyed; and that soon after the incendiary was discovered and brought to trial, and in his defence told the judge that instead of harm he had done good and that the prosecutor had been heard to thank God for it. Would the judge say, "Go your way?" Oh, no. (Cheers.) He would say, "The prisoner at the bar has violated the law of his country, and the sentence is that he undergo the punishment which the law directs." (Hear hear.) As to the plea that good had come out of his act, no thanks to him for it—it was an act of revenge or malice. The analogy between the two cases is complete. If God bring good out of evil no man could sin to serve Him. God should have the glory of all the good His wisdom and goodness accomplished, but man stood there just as guilty and as worthy of condemnation as though God had never overruled evil for good. (Applause.) The lecturer next spoke of the ultimate purpose of God in creating man. According to the New Testament God's purpose was to create a new heaven and a new earth in which there should for ever dwell righteousness—to bring about a condition of the highest blessedness possible, which shall endure for ever. That being so, they were prepared to hear the question put, and to answer it fairly—"Why was not

man made unable to sin, which would have prevented the intervening period of evil and placed the creature at once in possession of the blessedness which God designed for him?" Now, when we talk of the omnipotence of God, are we to be understood as meaning that God can do things absolutely contradictory? Unquestionably not. God is the God of truth, and cannot lie. In physical things He cannot create two hills without a valley between them. He could not create a circle without a centre, circumference, diameter. He could not move a table by argument or persuasion; it must cease to be wood or iron before he could move it by argument. This was not irreverent, but in harmony with the Bible. But the questioner said, "Why was not man made unable to sin?" He answered, because in that case he would not have been man. (Hear, hear.) If wood could be influenced by argument it would have been of our nature and not wood. Man is a free agent, and so long as God allows him to exist He must deal with him according to the nature that was given to him. In man we have a work of God's which not only differs in degree from His work in the heavens and nature, but in kind. Yon poor suffering woman, amidst all her privations, could say with the apostle. "I love him, because he first loved us." She gave voluntary service, and we saw in her what could not be seen in the solar system or in all the creations of God in the universe. She was a free agent, a reasonable being, who might expect by-and-by to be praised or blamed, rewarded or punished, according to her submission to the will of her Creator, according to her good or ill doing. The lecturer next urged that man's happiness required his freedom, and that in order to produce the highest possible blessing he should be free to obey or to disobey in this world. It was necessary that his promised blessedness should depend in a great measure on his knowledge of sin, pain, and death, on his knowledge of good and evil, on his knowing God. No man could appreciate the blessing of health like the man who had been delivered from extreme pain and suffering. To appreciate the highest degree of happiness we must have a personal acquaintance with its opposite. That highest happiness was to be perpetual. The Bible told them that into that eternal state sin and sorrow and death should not enter. The resurrected either would not or could not sin. If it be said they would not because they could not, they deprived them of the highest condition of enjoyment—liberty. It must, then, be because they would not. (Hear, hear.) But then where is the security that they would maintain that position?

Here it is "This is eternal life, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent." What would bind them there? The knowledge of God. He held that the first pair sinned in Eden because they did not know God. The old temptations could not avail when we know God, and hence he said that God would realise His purpose, that He would bring out of man's evil and sin an ultimate good, and by His overruling grace and power secure the ultimate utility of sin. (Applause.) Referring to the sufferings of the lost, the lecturer expressed his belief in everlasting punishment, but said he did not accept the extraordinary pictures drawn by those who endeavour to make everything connected with it as dark and black as they could. With God as with man the greatest good of the greatest number would be the overruling principle. He (the lecturer) was satisfied that if a man were lost it would be because he was determined to be lost, and not because he could not accept that by which he might be saved. By the one great sacrifice not only the comparatively few who formed the human race, but all the angelic order of creatures, the innumerable company of God's creatures would be blessed to an extent which they could not otherwise have been. If he were asked "Why not refrain from creating man," his answer was "That would have been allowing evil to have the conquest and to prevail for ever;" but he believed that out of man's wrong and sin, without lessening man's guilt, God would bless His people in perpetuity, and in a higher degree, so far as we could see, speaking in the light of reason as well as of revelation, than could otherwise have been realised. (Applause.)

Mr. ELLIS, of Manchester, said that unbelief was accounted a great sin in the theological world; but if a man could not believe, was he responsible? As belief affected a man's conduct he was not quite so free as Mr. King supposed. As a secularist he asked if the lecturer could accept his principles? It was a moral impossibility then, but a weight of evidence was put before him he must accept them. He (the speaker) was for years a congregationalist, but after he left Mr. Roseman's church he met with equally earnest people on the secular side, and his belief in the Bible was overthrown; and that being so, he could not help it.

Mr. KING said the questioner took the position that if a man could not believe he could not be condemned for not believing. He was perfectly at one with him on that point. He learnt from the teaching of the Bible that where little is given little is expected, and God would hold a man re-

sponsible for what he had, and not for what he had not. But it was one thing for a man to suppose that he could not believe, and another thing for him to be unable to believe. Supposing their friend to be all that constituted a man physically and intellectually, he (Mr. King) could not accept his statement that he could not believe the Gospel of Christ. He believed that Mr. Ellis was mistaken on that point. He (Mr. King) could not believe in secularism because it was opposed to the Gospel, which he had undeniable and incontrovertible evidence is the Gospel of Truth. There was not a secularist in the land who carried out his own theory about responsibility; he had never yet known a consistent secularist; and he maintained that

every man who was in possession of all the intellectual faculties might find for himself satisfactory evidence of the truthfulness of the Gospel. (Applause.)

Nothing seemed so to afflict the Secularists as Mr. King's earnest appeals to believers not to allow a penny of their money to reach the pockets of Infidel lecturers.

In the event of there being no more acceptable report forwarded for the pages of the *B. H.* the foregoing will suffice to give its readers an idea of this effort to defend the truth in the town of Bury.

UNITARIANISM AN OUTPOST OF INFIDELITY.

March 5, 1870.

"As to Unitarianism, I look upon it as an *outpost* of Infidelity, and deem it a part of Christian work and duty to refute it.—D. K."

Dear Sir,—Do you remember some years since writing two kind and friendly notes to the humble individual who now addresses you? At that time I sent you a tract, entitled "Two Hundred and Thirteen Questions," and requested you to answer them. Instead of "deeming it your duty" to refute what portion of Unitarianism there was in them, you refused (courteously I confess), saying the number was too great and would take up too much time. I then reminded you that the questions as a whole comprised one great principle, and that in answering one you answered all, so as at once to declare yourself for or against the principle or doctrine upheld by the questions. Yet you still refused to answer them, and I heard no more from you. It is plain you did not then "deem it a Christian duty to refute" Unitarianism; of which Universalism, or the Infinite Love of God is a part. At any rate, you neglected what you considered a part of your "work and duty" as a Christian Evangelist.

I have had frequent opportunities of reading your magazine, and, as far as I know, you have never written a single essay therein, with a view to refuting the doctrine of the Divine Unity. Which (as it is part of the "work and duty of a 'Christian,'") you should have done.

I know you have a great deal to occupy your time as Evangelist and Editor. But will you have the kindness just to answer one simple question. *Why* do you consider Unitarianism an *outpost of Infidelity*? and what is the meaning of the expression? Just a simple answer will be sufficient.

One more remark and I close. Although Mr. Mitchell does not reside in Birmingham, there are Unitarian Ministers residing in that town who would be ready and willing to debate with you, should you consent to act up to your "Christian work and duty," in refuting their arguments.

Trusting you will forgive my plainness of speech in writing, and hoping you will find time to answer my one question, relative to the *outpost* of Infidelity.—I am, dear Sir; very truly yours,
ELIZA.

A simple answer to the question, why we consider "Unitarianism an outpost of Infidelity," is demanded by our courteous correspondent. It may suffice if we give one of the several reasons which compel us to form the estimate to which our fair friend objects. Unitarianism recognizes ministers and covers teaching which falls but little short of the rejection of the Bible common among avowed Secularists. A charge thus made should be supported by evidence, and, therefore, the following is offered as nearest to hand. In a sermon by the Rev. J. P. Hopps, "preached before the members and friends of the Scottish Unitarian Association," and designed to prove that the Unitarian Church is to be the Church of the future, we read—

"The cardinal error of the old theology is that religious truth is not naturally and progressively discovered but miraculously and exceptionally revealed,—that it has nothing to do with the natural history of

the world, and nothing to do with the progress of the human mind. This is an error, the parent of many others. It has lead, for instance, to the divorce between Reason and Religion, of which I spoke just now. It has lead to the curious idea that the whole mind of God was made known once for all to an obscure race in an obscure corner of the world, some thousands of years ago, and that the infallible truth of God, concerning man, duty, the soul, the future life, and Himself, is to be found, and found only, in some few fragments of writing preserved in an ancient book. And, worst of all, it has led to the practical banishment of God from the religious life of every succeeding age, and to the fatal doctrine that in the matter of religion we have not to look forward but backward, to find the light of the perfect day. To what other evils it has lead, anyone may see who will look around: for Christendom is still cursed with a doctrine that makes inspiration a gift of the past, shuts up revelation to a written word, and virtually tells us that we have nothing to do but to count syllables, and then to believe them or be damned.

"In direct opposition to this, our Church teaches that religious truth has, in the past, been discovered, and, in the future, will be discovered, according to the natural law of human progress. Instead of *Revelation*, we talk about *Discovery*, but still acknowledge that God is the author of every good and perfect gift. Instead of an Inspiration that was an exceptional fact 2,000 years ago, we speak of an Inspiration that is universal and perennial, dependent for its effects only upon the varied capacities of man to receive. Instead of a book that is shut we tell of a soul that is still open."

In the foregoing, *revelation* is scouted and religion is a *discovery*. The men who teach and approve the above are not *going* to infidelity, but are already infidel. Christianity, as delivered by Christ and His Apostles, is not held by them. Unitarians

they may be, as are Jews and Turks, and as was Payne and other noted infidels; but their claiming the name of Christ is pure deception. We are aware that many Unitarians will not endorse the sentiments quoted, but that they are delivered to an association and held, substantially, by many is enough to justify the remark to which our correspondent objects.

Our neglecting to answer 213 questions, two years ago, is not incompatible with deeming it a duty to refute Unitarianism. That it is part of our duty, as Editor and Evangelist, to combat a certain error by no means renders it requisite to answer every tract that may be forwarded nor to debate with every person who may oppose.

Our friend intimates that though Mr. Mitchel does not reside in Birmingham, there are Unitarian Ministers in that town ready and willing to debate with us. It *may* be so, but the fact is not known to us. There are Unitarian Ministers in Birmingham, but they pretty much confine their ministrations to their own chapels, and are not particularly aggressive. Under these circumstances there is no demand for interference on our part. But if said ministers are desirous of discussion in the pages of the *B. H.* they can be accommodated upon the fair and reasonable condition that the articles on both sides also appear in a Unitarian publication. Not otherwise do we dispose to introduce them to our readers. D. K.

THE OLD COOPER SHOP.

THE inauguration of the old Cooper Shop in Cincinnati was a memorable occasion. Numerous converts were made in the meetings held there, and the old rude building will never be forgotten. I had been preaching several years in that city, then containing about twenty thou-

sand inhabitants. The house was situated on Second Street, between Walnut and Main, if my memory serves me. It was a two-storey building, say 40x70. The lower storey was used as a cooper-shop. The upper story we rented, and in a rude way fitted up for a

chapel. We put up a simple stand for a pulpit, and in the centre of the room we hung up our chandeliers, suspended upon a rope and made of cross pieces of boards for our tallow candles. The large room was as well lighted up as most churches were in those days. Lamps were but little used, and they were constantly getting up some patent affair for the burning of lard or lard-oil. We held to the old tallow candles, with now and then, by way of luxury, the sperm. So common was their use, that the ordinary appointments for preaching at night, were always stated to be, "at early candle-lighting." So accustomed was I to this, that in after life, even to this day, I have often been tempted, in making appointments for the evening, to say, "at early candle-lighting." I may not have spoken the words, but they have been on my lips. Indeed, once in Philadelphia when gas was the only light in our churches (I don't speak ironically, dear reader), I actually announced that we would have meeting "at early candle-light." I saw a smile playing on the features of some of the brethren, and for the first time recognized the *faux pas*, and smiled too. Some of them asked what hour "early candle light" was?

In those days—I wonder if they were not better days than the present—we met at "early candle-light." We did not wait for seven or eight in the evening; but at an early hour we assembled for worship. I can not say that we returned home any sooner, for the time we assembled. In those good old times we would sing a great many songs at our meetings, and long ones at that—as "Whenshall I see Jesus?" "Rejoice, O, earth, the Lord is King," and "When the King of kings comes." We hadn't A. D. Fillmore then to make tunes for us. We made, some of us, our own tunes, or we gathered them up wherever we could find them.

We took from the world some of their choicest melodies, and did not think that we had done anything worthy of bonds in so doing. By the way, music is about the only thing that is free from defilement. It may be married to words and acts that, by association, may defile it. But melody, apart from evil associations, is one of the purest things known. It is one of heaven's best gifts. I say, then, in those good old times we sung a great deal, at home and in our meetings; and we sung with a vim. There was nothing of that artificial and conventional strain that is now heard, as if we thought, "Well, now, what will Mrs. Grundy say?" We did not care a fig for Mrs. Grundy. We did not think that she was present. The fact is, in that day she was not often seen by the light of our tallow candles. We used, when we felt like it, to close by singing some tender, brotherly-love song, and shake hands with each other. We didn't think how it looked in the eyes of the world; or what some young foggy thought of it. Love has its own ways of expression, and generally the right way. The whole was as spontaneous as the bursting of buds when June is upon the forest and the field.

The songs of the sanctuary, when the heart is enlisted in them, are like the full-blown rose in its intoxicating richness. A distinguished artist once said, when speaking of the melodies of Mozart, that they "seemed to her, not so much composed, as found—found on some sunshiny day in Arcadia, among nymphs and flowers—not inventions but existences." All true poetry in song is of this nature—not so much composed as "found"—not inventions, but existences." The one reason why so much of the music in these gaseous days is so poor, is that it does not "exist" in nature, but is "invented." It is a manikin, and not a living man—a dead branch,

and not a living one, full of sap, and bursting forth in leaf and flower. Let no one write music unless his "soul is full of it," and then it is "a joy for ever."

It was a custom in those "tallow candle times," to have a suitable song ready; and as soon as the last words were uttered by the preacher, the song was sung. It came forth like a stream of light behind a cloud. It was a blending of the sermon and the song—the thunder following the lightning. After this came exhortations, and they were forked streams of lightening, accompanied with awful thunder-peals; "And in his temple did every one speak of his glory."

It does seem to me that the old power of exhortation is dying out. Few now have it. Did you ever hear a true soldier calling "To arms! to arms!" "Victory and death!" "To the Pyramids!" O you should have heard Walter Scott speaking—now with the tearful tenderness of Jeremiah, and then with the brazen fierceness of Ezekiel, if you would know what the spirit of exhortation is; or John T. Johnson fixing his eagle eye upon the aliens—his face pale with emotion, and his voice as martial as any leader of conquering armies, saying: "Who would not be a soldier!" I sometimes "think that we shall never more, at any future, delight our souls with talk of knightly deeds, walking about the gardens and the halls of Camelot, as in the days that were." And yet when I say this, I don't reflect upon the brain or heart of "noble Spartan youth" of these times. They are not surrounded with the circumstances that call out and make such men. Some of these warriors stay at home, make money, and write terrible philippics against 'persons and things that do not please them; and think that they are valiant for the truth. Others, with pen never dry, and with good pay, roll off their sheet-lightning and distant thunder,

that kills nobody, and really think they are doing God service. If such men would "suffer" for the cause of Christ, they would "grow strong." But a thousand years of such ministry will not be equal to ten in the days of the old "tallow candles."

We were very fond of protracted meetings in those days. They were apostolic and fruitful. They were a mighty power. Some, now-a-days, speak reproachfully of them. I wonder if they are not the fruit of them!

Peter and the eleven held very protracted meetings in Jerusalem, and filled it with disciples. From the first day that Paul came into Asia, he had been with the people at all seasons, day and night, "Testifying both to Jews and Greeks repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." He held a protracted meeting for two years and more in Ephesus—that was a pretty long meeting. In Rome "Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him." Let us have such protracted meetings as these, in which there shall be preaching to the sinners and teaching to the saints. Let the "young men who are strong," bear the brunt of the battle—fight until they are covered all over with honorable scars. Let them, by the living voice, and by the sword of the Spirit, do valiantly for the King; and let the aged give counsel and aid by their prayers and exhortations; and when they feel the "motions" of that mighty Spirit which the son of Manoaah felt when he laid hold of the pillars of the temple of the Philistines, and shook them till it fell on

"Lords, ladies, captains, counsellors
and priests,

Their choice nobility and flower."
preach Christ and him crucified—the wisdom of God, and the power of God.

JAMES CHALLEN.

EVANGELISTIC CO-OPERATION FOR WALES.

MERTHYR TYDVIL.—Dear Brother King, shortly after the Annual General Meeting at Liverpool, the Church here forwarded a letter to the Churches in Wales, proposing the formation of an Evangelist Fund for Wales, and urging that a Meeting of brethren from the Welsh Churches be held at Merthyr, or some other place proposed by the majority, for the purpose of calling out an Evangelist or Evangelists. From the replies we found the Churches unanimous in their desire for said Fund, and also, that it would be better to call the Meeting at Rhos, being more central in position, and between North and South Wales. In order that no time should be lost, we deemed it advisable to stir up the brethren to commence the Fund at once. In order to avoid the cause of the discontinuance of the former Welsh Annual Meetings, we propose that the business commence in the morning, and continue (with intervals for refreshments) through the day, until concluded.

We shall be pleased if you and other English brethren can attend. The Church at Rhos express their desire, if you can arrange to be present, to arrange for a lecture on the Monday evening.

We enclose copy of circular sent to the Welsh Churches, including Chester and Mollington.

J. T. MORGAN.

The circular referred to in the above note reads as follows—

TO THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST AT —.

Dear Brethren, having duly considered the various letters received from the Churches on the above subject, we beg to state that we think it advisable to call a General Meeting of brethren from the various Churches in Wales, to be held at Rhos-lanerochrugog, on the first Tuesday in May.

Also that an Evangelist Fund be *immediately* established, for which purpose our respected Bro. W. Williams, of Criccieth, has kindly consented to act as Treasurer, until the general meeting; so that by the time the meeting is held, we may be able to see what we are able to do towards supporting Evangelists in Wales.

Never has there been such a good opportunity for making known the Truth in Wales, as at present; truly the fields are white unto the harvest—but where are the labourers? We therefore ask you, brethren, in the name of the Lord, to do your utmost to enable the meeting to call at least one brother into the field.

As you are well aware of the great need which exists for earnest, zealous, and faithful preachers of the Truth, we need only add that we have in view at least one well known, zealous brother, able to do the

work of an Evangelist in the Welsh language, who is both ready and willing to devote himself to the work.

Trusting that you will promptly improve this opportunity of co-operating with those who would spend and be spent in the Lord's service.

We are, dear brethren, yours faithfully in
Jesus, J. T. MORGAN, THOMAS JENKINS
DAVID LEWIS.

Merthyr Tydvil, Jan. 17th, 1870.

N.B.—Propositions from Churches unable to send brethren to the meeting may be sent by letter to J. T. MORGAN, 19, Glebe-land Street, Merthyr Tydvil. All Remittances should be sent and Post Office Orders made payable to WILLIAM WILLIAMS Manchester House, Criccieth, Carnarvonshire.

For two or three years we have urged co-operation with a view to sustaining evangelistic efforts in the Principality. The General Annual Meeting requested us to visit the Welsh Churches in order to promote the same, which would have been done had not illness, on two occasions, prevented the intention from being carried out. As it was we could only seek to promote the object by writing to those likely to move in the matter.

The circular calling the meeting at Rhos does not emanate from any direct effort on our part, nor did we know of the intention of the Merthyr brethren to issue it till it came to hand; nor do we now know more than the circular sets forth. The Church in Merthyr is, perhaps, the smallest in Wales, and the call might have come with somewhat stronger force had it emanated from two or three of the larger Churches; but when the stronger do not move the weaker may do good service by using the strength they have; and, therefore, we would that every Church, and every member, respond and make the Meeting a success. It matters but little who calls so that the response is heartily made and good work done. Perhaps our active brethren would have done quite as well simply to have called

the Meeting, leaving it to appoint a treasurer and commence the fund. But, be that as it may, what more they have done can do no harm presuming, as we do, that their appointments only hold good till the meeting is brought together, and that then the assembly will appoint its committee and officers and complete all necessary arrangements without

being at all restrained by the preliminary action of those to whom they will be indebted for the steps requisite to convene the Meeting.

Whether we shall be able to attend cannot now be stated, but in the meantime communications from brethren feeling an interest in the proposed effort will be received with pleasure. D. K.

W. HINDLE—FAREWELL MEETINGS.

LORD'S-DAY, March 13, W. Hindle preached the Gospel in the Christian meeting-house, Wigan, and on Monday a large company took tea in the school room; after which a public meeting was held in the chapel, presided over by T. Coop. The following is from the *Wigan Observer*:

The Chairman after a few observations called upon

Mr. Tickle, of Liverpool, who said he had come forward to explain the object which had brought them together. Mr. Hindle had been engaged in that district for upwards of four years, and during that time had been a zealous and earnest preacher of the gospel. He had been during the whole of that time working in co-operation with the committee, and the committee's hope was that he would be spared to labour in this country for a long time to come. They saw that he was making himself acquainted with the work, was peculiarly fitted for the task, and had a peculiar work to perform. There had arisen circumstances which made him determine to devote himself to the service of God in another country. He had had an offer from brethren in Australia to preach the word there, and, after deep consideration has come to the conclusion that it was his duty to leave England. They had confidence in their brother, and were met together that evening to recommend him to the guidance of their heavenly Father. He said they were sorry to part with him, but they did so in good fellowship, and wished him a happy journey. They had this compensation in losing him, they knew that he was going to labour amongst brethren, divided from them by the sea, they were one in spirit, and when he arrived he would have the assurance that there were hearts in this country wishing for his welfare.

Mr. David King, of Birmingham, next addressed the meeting, and said he liked to be there and he did not like to be there. There was nothing at any time which gave

him so great pain as parting from a dear brother. Parting had with it always some sorrow, and yet there was always with it some joy—sorrow because we do not like to be separated from those we love, and joy because we have a sure and certain hope that we shall meet them hereafter. He (the speaker) could say on this occasion that if it had been left to him whether Br. Hindle should go to Australia, they would not have had a parting that evening. Although they were not at all satisfied with the course he had taken, he was sure that Mr. Hindle thought it his duty to go. He (the speaker) had learned that the field is the world, and that when a man gave himself up to preach the gospel he should be prepared to go anywhere in that field—like sometimes felt as if he wished the colonies were nearer, and other times that they were far away, especially when they were taking from them a brother like the one now leaving them. He would just say a word or two in reference to the work of an evangelist. It was the duty of every Christian both young and old to preach the gospel. There was no clergy in the Church of Christ. All God's people were his priests, and in God's Church all were clergymen and clergywomen, and should make it their duty to make known the gospel. He hoped they would find men and women who would say that that work should be their work. Mr. King concluded by expressing a wish that the Lord might grant their brother safe passage, and that he might be enabled to use the opportunities afforded of conveying the truth to those who would travel with him to the distant land to which he was bound.

An anthem was then given, after which Mr. Hindle addressed the meeting at considerable length, reviewing his past life and the means by which he was led to be baptized in Christ unto death; and said there was no church which he had ever visited with more pleasure than the church at Wigan, and in saying this he was not forgetting the sympathy and love which

had been accorded to him in other places. He was glad that they were satisfied with his motive in leaving England. The speaker expressed his thanks to God that he had been spared to labour among his fellow men in England, and said he was not leaving England to escape that work of labour and love. He was not going away from any human or earthly considerations, but to proclaim the gospel to sinners. He impressed his hearers with the necessity of giving themselves up to God's work, and hoped that the churches in the district would feel they were brothers and sisters of one family, with one common object to attain.

A hymn was then sung, and after prayer the meeting dispersed.

The parting hand was then taken, and Br. Hindle left Wigan to reach the Great Britain steamer, which was to leave Liverpool on Saturday, March 19. May the Lord give the

winds and waves charge concerning him.

The placard announcing the public meeting also made known that D. King would lecture on the Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday evenings following. Accordingly three discourses were delivered—1. The History of the Remission of Sins.—2. Remission of Sins—Its Basis.—3. On some of the Types of Christianity. Meetings five nights in succession did not give so large gatherings as some had hoped for, but the attention was most marked, and the last was the largest. The previous Lord's-day D. King addressed the Church and preached the Gospel in Southport.

ITEMS OF NEWS.

SPAIN.—We are still staying in Madrid, because of the very open door. The distribution of the Scriptures and tracts still goes on, only limited by our strength and ability to supply. The people are most eager to receive tracts and books. We continue to go from house to house, taking all, rich and poor, without distinction, giving copies of the Gospel of John. Two new halls have been opened, since we came, for preaching. These are not held without some opposition. A hall was taken away the other day, and efforts are being made to get the new ones from us. But the having to move from place to place may be one way of accomplishing the testimony of the grace of God to these hundreds of thousands of souls. From time to time our hearts are gladdened by persons coming forward to confess what the Lord has done for them. Halls may be obtained, and the people press into them until there is no room for more, and listen most attentively.

A. R. FENN.

Calle de Jesus del Valle, Madrid.

PERSIA.—A Bible-colporteur, under the direction of Mr. Bliss, at Constantinople, is travelling through the almost unknown mountain regions of Persia, and meeting with very great encouragement from Moslems, Armenians, Jews, and others. "At Bashkullah," he says, "a crowd of Jews and Armenians were gathered around me, with a few Moslems, listening. After a long talk, and the reading of several proof texts, a Moslem rose to his feet and said to the

people with a loud voice, 'The truth is that you are all in fault; the true books are the Old and New Testaments.' He then asked me for a New Testament, paid its price, and began at once reading it. Among others there was a like spirit of enquiry. A secretary of the Governor bought a Testament, saying, 'By the time I have read this through I shall be a Protestant.' At Nudus, deep in the Koordish region, a place never visited by a colporteur before, and considered dangerous, he says—"A young Armenian priest came to me in the greatest anxiety to buy a Testament, but I had sold the last one to one of his neighbours. He besought me to take it away from his neighbour and give it to him, saying, 'I will use it constantly, teaching others, and he will not.' But I declined; so he went himself, and by entreaty obtained the book, and at once went into the village and began to explain it to a company of men. When I left for another village, he came with me, and brought along his Testament and the Psalms (which he had also bought of me), and all the way was explaining the Scriptures to his companions. As soon as we sat down in the village, he opened the Gospels to a large company, and till dark (not less than two hours) he continued reading and expounding. Early in the morning he was again with me, constantly reading to the people. This, so far as is known, is the first modern New Testament that has reached this secluded valley." Of another field he says—"Scores of the men in Van said to me, 'Bring us

Bibles in the modern language, and we will buy as many as you can bring.' This they said publicly, and not a man did I see who tried to make a disturbance. A few years ago they burned the books brought to their city."—*Christian Work*.

BETHANY, VIRGINIA.—Dr. Richardson, of Bethany, under date Feb. 22, writes—"In this country the cause of truth is making rapid progress. There are numerous accessions in all parts of the country. Br. Shaw has just closed a meeting of some three weeks' continuance in Wellsburg, our county seat, during which 120 persons became obedient to the faith. Such large additions naturally call upon the elders of the Church to be diligent in their efforts to instruct and build up those who are introduced into the Kingdom. In order that abiding in Christ, and having His word abiding in them, they may bring forth fruit to the glory of God. E. C.

AUSTRALIA.—To the Editor of the *British Harbinger*.—It is with much pleasure that I report the first united meeting of the Mutual Improvement Societies in connection with the Brethren located in Melbourne, which took place December 15. The following societies were represented—The Adelpian Class, Lygon Street; The Adelpian Class, Prahran, and The Carlton Mutual Improvement Society, in connection with Brethren meeting in Manchester Unity Hall. After an excellent tea, provided in Manchester Unity Hall, the business of the evening commenced. At eight o'clock, the hour at which the public were invited, a goodly number of Brethren and friends assembled. Br. Shaw having been voted to the chair, the meeting was opened by hymn and prayer, after which the chairman made suitable remarks, dwelling upon the fact "that a young man can be very much that which he chooses. The following brethren then engaged in exercises as annexed—1. Br. Moisey, a reading "On the Existence of a God."—2. Br. Sharp, an Essay, "Humility exemplified in the Life of Christ."—3. Br. Wrix, an Address, "The Glory and Shame of Man."—4. Br. B. Kemp, a Recitation, "The Water and

the Flower."—5. Br. Stevenson, an Essay, "Some thoughts on the Life of Christ."—6. Br. Wells, an Address, "Do thou therefore endure hardness as a good soldier of Christ."—7. Br. James McGregor, an Essay, "On Pure Religion."—8. Br. Dunn, an Address, "Phases of Faith and Worship, Christain and otherwise." The chairman's closing remarks, and prayer by Br. McGregor, terminated the meeting.

F. G. DUNN.

BURY.—I am constrained to seek a corner for a word or two upon the effect of the recent lectures by the Editor of the *B. H.* Gentlemen of several denominations have intimated, that not in the memory of the oldest inhabitant has Bury had so rich a treat in the form of an effort to defend Christianity. That this was generally considered to be the case was evident from the increased attendance each night, the dead silence with which the people heard, and the immense cheering with which that silence was at times broken. It will take Secularism in Bury a long time to recover this blow. I enquired of one of Bradlaugh's ticket-takers, whether they intended to bring him to reply. He answered, "No; he wants too much brass." There are two parties who are sore on account of the lectures—the Secularists, and their next neighbours, the Unitarians. The former party had two lecturers present at each of Mr. King's lectures. One of them, a Bury man, who has been active for a number of years. He, on the first two nights, kept as quiet as a newly-yeaned lamb, and evidently spoke on the subsequent nights only, because he was taunted on account of his silence. The other, who was sent for from another town, exhorted his friends not to reply, but to leave the matter for Mr. Bradlaugh; and thus for two nights, the time allowed to opponents was not occupied.

J. B.

Obituary.

ABIGAIL PALMER, fell asleep in Jesus, March 3rd, 1870, aged 62.
Whitehaven.

G. S.

Family Room.

A FEW THOUGHTS.

OUR life, it is a vapour. It gathers, it glitters, in the sunlight, and then passes away. And is that all? Is there nothing which we can call our own? Is there nothing over

which the years and the ages roll not in vain? Is there nothing which the irresistible stream of time does not bear away? Yes, there is something: the true life is such a thing. Every

good deed, every good word, every good thought, abideth amid multitudinous changes. It enters into and becomes a part of the indestructible and permanent. It is caught up by the passing generation; it is transmitted from mouth to mouth, from heart to heart, and so abideth forever. Yes, character is such a thing. The wisdom that comes to the seeking mind; the affection that glows in the devoted heart; the peace passing understanding, that is found in the faithful bosom,—they are everlasting. Yes, faith is such a thing, and also goodness; for whosoever liveth and believeth shall never die, and whosoever doeth the will of God shall abide for ever.

What, then, remains for us but to remember what we are, and for what we are destined,—so frail in our mortal lives; so imperishable in the life of the affections? We are here to-day and to-morrow we die. And would we die utterly? Would we leave the world, and leave no monument and memorial of our existence, and carry with us no consciousness that we have made the world better and happier than we found it? We meet like two freighted trains on the track, glance at each other an instant, and then rush on. We come to the solemn gathering; we hear familiar names, we gaze on familiar faces; we come again, and one and another are not here. How tenderly should creatures so related feel toward each other; how slow to be angered, and to vex each other, and neglect the common good; how swift to hear and go forth, and toil for the common benefit! Ah! think how soon all will be over. The day of

grace will have gone; and the opportunity to serve God and man will have ended. The ears into which we might breathe one word more of kindness will have closed; the heart in which we might awaken one more thrill of gratification, will have ceased its beating; and the countenance on which we might spread one more expression of pleasure, will be composed and still in the grave. We look upon those whom we may bless, they are gone while we gaze; we listen to catch the familiar accents, and hear only the melancholy wind that sighs over them. We too will soon go to swell the vast congregation of the dead. Soon we shall be gathered by the side of those who are already gone. We vanish like the dreams of the night; we disappear like the dews of the morning. The coming summer the grass will grow green, and the dew drop brilliantly sparkle on its pendant blades —But it may be upon our graves.— Though in health and strength to-day, we cannot tell how soon the summons may come for us; and if we are only worthy it matters not when we are called beyond the “silent river,” where there will be no

“Changing, changing day after day,
Near ones, and dear ones, passing away;
Scenes dear to the heart and the eye,
Passing away as the time goes by.”

In patience, then, let us wait the change which must surely come to us, and so live that we may welcome its coming; for that which is purest and best here will go with us into other domains of God, and to be the pledge of our acceptance, and the crown of our rejoicings.

A. J. C.

WEARING MOURNING.

WE long for the day when this custom shall be obsolete. It is unbecoming the truly afflicted one. The wearer says by the black garments: “I have lost a dear friend.

I am in deep sorrow.” But true grief does not wish to parade itself before the eye of the stranger; much less does it assert its extent. The stricken one naturally goes apart

from the world to pour out tears. Real affliction seeks privacy. It is no respect to the departed friend to say that we are in sorrow. If we have real grief, it will be discovered. When God has entered a household with His awful chastisement of death, it is time for religious meditation and communion with God on the part of the survivors. How sadly out of place, then, are the milliner and dressmaker, the trying on of dresses, and the trimming of bonnets. There is something profane in exciting the vanity of a young girl by fitting a waist or trying on a hat, when the corpse of a father is lying in an adjoining room. It is a sacrilege to drag the widow forth from her grief to be fitted for a gown, or to select a veil. It is often terribly

oppressive to the poor. The widow, left desolate, with half a dozen little children, the family means already reduced by the long sickness of the father, must draw on her scanty purse to pay for a new wardrobe for herself and children, throwing away the goodly stock of garments already prepared, when she most likely knows not where she is to get bread for those little ones. Truly may fashion be called a tyrant, when it robs a widow of her last shilling. Surely your sorrow will not be questioned, even if you should not call in the milliner to help display it. Do not, in your affliction, help to uphold a custom which will turn the afflictions of your poorer neighbour to deeper poverty, as well as sorrow.—*The Central Baptist.*

TACT.

Love swings on little hinges. It keeps an active little servant to do a good deal of its fine work. The name of this little servant is Tact. Tact is a nimble-footed and nimble-fingered servant. Tact sees without looking, and has always a good deal of small change on hand; Tact carries no heavy weapons, but can do wonders with a sling and stone; Tact never runs against a stone wall, but always finds a sycamore tree up which to climb when things are becoming crowded and unman-

ageable on the level ground; Tact has a wonderful way of availing itself of a word or a smile, or a gracious wave of the hand; Tact carries a bunch of curiously-fashioned keys, that open all kinds of doors; Tact plants its monosyllables wisely, for being a monosyllable itself, it arranges its own order with all the familiarity of friendship; Tact, sly, versatile, divining, running, flying Tact, governs the world, yet touches the big baby under the impression that it has not been touched at all.

NEATNESS AND ORDER.

NEATNESS and order are enjoined not only by economy but by comfort. Every negligent mother resigns one of the choicest pleasures within her reach that of seeing her house and home surrounded by the marks of neatness, industry, and taste. She brings up her family amidst confusion, and presents to her children an example of negligence the most unpardonable. Can she wonder if they follow her

example? They will go further. In their partialities, they will have a vicious preference for what good sense and sound economy would condemn. They will regard with less respect the decencies of life, and be more likely to abandon the paths of virtue and morality. There is much meaning in the old adage, "Have a place for everything, and keep everything in its place."

Christianity and Infidelity.

THE DECADENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.

BRADLAUGH has held some large meetings in London, and his *National Reformer* is jubilant. Hence a recent issue congratulates its friends in an article headed "*The Decadence of Christianity*." We were smiling over the production, when a contemporary, not known to our readers generally, took the said article in hand and supplied pretty much what was in our own mind. He says, "The writer whose signature is "Index," most jubilantly proclaims that the days of Christianity are numbered, that it is destined soon to take rank among things that have been and are no more, and that its abolition will be a mighty blessing to mankind. 'Christianity,' says 'Index,' 'has had a long innings. For over 1,800 years, accepting for this her own allegations, she has fattened on the souls and bodies of the poor and ignorant, her followers. Millions, yea trillions of money have been wasted on her priests and altars, and the rivers of blood and tears shed on her behalf would almost fill an ocean; and to all these sacrifices—for sacrifices they most undoubtedly were—we cry *cui bono*! At last, some at least of the sleepers have awakened; aye, and those who have been pointed to the right path have little inclination to relapse into their former state of ignorance and piety: for piety and ignorance in most cases, are synonymous terms. The fiat has gone forth, and Christianity is doomed! She has played her part on this troublous sphere, and right troublously has she played it too."

Setting aside the affirmation that piety and ignorance are generally associated, while wondering whether Newton, and Locke, and Brewster, and Herschel are to be regarded as instances of the rule, we set ourselves

to the consideration of two distinct questions which are here presented to us. Is it true that 'Christianity is doomed?' If it be so, or if it were so, is this a matter to be rejoiced in or a matter to be deplored? These questions we shall briefly consider, following, in our consideration of the former, the leading of 'Index,' and examining all the reasons that he furnishes for his opinion.

1. As to the question of fact, and the indications pointed out by 'Index,' that Christianity is doomed speedily to pass away. The first ground of this expectation is stated in these words:—"What have we to say about the decay of this gigantic superstition? Is it not palpable? Witness the crowds who flock to hear the secular lectures every high day and holiday." Now, from the 'Guide to the Lecture-room,' published weekly in the *National Reformer*, we learn that there are eighteen places in London, and twenty-four in the remainder of Great Britain, three being in Scotland, where these lectures are given. At one of these places it would appear that meetings are held four times a week, at some of them twice, at most once a week, at a few once a fortnight, and at a few once a month. As nearly as we can make out, the number of meetings in a month of four weeks is 194—say, however, 200, or an average of fifty per week. We are unable to ascertain the attendance at these meetings; but we are pretty confident that we shall not be contradicted when we assert that, taking one week with another, and one place with another, that the average attendance at each meeting is not over 300. Verily, the little finger of Christianity is still thicker than the loins of Secularism.

Surely there is no lack of charity in supposing that a considerable portion of these audiences are attracted by novelty, and a considerable portion more by the sensational character of the subjects discussed.

We know the objection that will be made to this course of argument. It will be said that secularism is still in its infancy, that its future is all before it, and that the number of its adherents in Great Britain is not to be considered so much as an indication of what is as a presage of what is to be. Certainly it is not for any Christian, remembering the upper room at Jerusalem, to 'despise the day of small things.' But we have our answer ready to this objection. First, this is not the view that 'Index' presents to us. Secondly, it does not follow that, because one system has increased from small beginnings to world-wide magnitude, therefore every system whose beginnings are small is destined to great expansion. Thirdly, secularism is not new; it is almost as old as Christianity itself. If Christianity has 'kept her innings' for eighteen centuries, she has had to guard her wickets all that time. The attacks that are made upon her now are not materially different from those which she has repelled again and again before.

The next reason consists of three facts; *first*, that a Congregational minister in Dundee has demitted his charge in consequence of a change in his opinions; *secondly*, that a gentleman has bequeathed £2,000 to Bishop Colenso; and *thirdly*, that a proposal has been made to repeal the law which prevents ministers of the Church of England from representing constituencies in Parliament. We suppose all these to be facts as stated. What then? For aught that appears, the Dundee minister may be a believer in Christianity still, although he may have ceased to hold the peculiar tenets of the religious body

to which he belonged. But suppose it be not so, did no infidel ever become a Christian? Does conversion of an infidel to Christianity prove Christianity to be true? Surely not. Then neither does the conversion of a Christian to infidelity prove the truth of infidelity. As to the legacy to Bishop Colenso, if it proves that his views are sound, what shall we say of the millions of pounds that are every year given voluntarily for the support of Christian missions, for our Bible and Tract Societies? We fail to see what possible bearing the proposed repeal of the Act referred to can have upon the point at issue. We are not aware that the Christian cause was strengthened by the law when it was enacted; we cannot imagine that the cause would be weakened by its repeal.

2. We presume our readers will be surprised to find that we have so soon done with our first question. Is this all, they will ask, that the writer has to bring in support of his opinion? Yes, absolutely all! We think it will be generally admitted that, if there be no more signs of decadence than these, Christianity will probably survive yet awhile; yea, may possibly even cast off the symptoms of decay, and obtain a new lease of life and vigour. We fancy that at various periods of her history her prospects have been even darker than they are now.

But while we do not despair of the recovery of Christianity from the effects of the latest assault upon her, it may be not out of place to inquire what would be the result if it were to be otherwise. Would the disappearance of Christianity from the world be a matter for rejoicing, or a matter for regret? First, it is manifest that it would be an utter and absolute revolutionizing of all that is most important in human thought and interests. A man with any breadth of view would not dream of

the abolition of Christianity as of the going down of a wicket in the cricket-field, but rather as upon the shivering of a great world, or the extinction of a mighty sun, around which many worlds revolve. The good or the evil of its extinction would be infinitely greater than 'Index' is at all capable of apprehending. The question, therefore, is one of tremendous moment, whether good or evil would be the result? With a somewhat more adequate appreciation of the gravity of the issue, we still say if the system is false let it go, whatever temporary evils may be the consequence of its departure. But if it be true, let us hope and pray that it may endure, although it might be supposed that some incidental evil might be removed along with it.

In considering the question whether the disappearance of Christianity from the world is a thing to be desired or a thing to be deprecated, it may be safely assumed that it would not be superseded by Paganism in any of its forms, or by Judaism or Mohammedism. Its only possible successor is either Deism or Atheism. The first result of the abolition of Christianity would be a fight between these two candidates for the succession. If the question were not determined, as probably it would not be, the contest would be prolonged indefinitely, and would certainly produce evil consequences, at least as great as any that have followed from the religious controversies of the past. It is not for us to decide which of the two competitors would gain the day. Probably they would 'have their innings' alternately, or more probably each would have his partisans continuously, and the strife would be handed down to many generations. Now, what are the qualifications of these two candidates, the one or other of which must occupy the throne which is, on the supposition, to be evacuated by Christianity, or which must divide

between them the empire which Christianity is supposed to be about to evacuate?

What of Deism? We hesitate not to say that of all systems this is the least fitted to give happiness and peace to an earnest, thoughtful man. Sufficient to suggest questions of terrible import, insufficient to resolve them, it leaves the earnest inquirer in a state of utter and irreparable despair. Wherewithal shall I come before God?—how shall I approach the Most High? This is the question which Deism compels me to put, the question which Deism cannot enable me to answer. We can very easily conceive that men may put this question away from them, and drown its voice by the noise of revelry or the din of worldly affairs; but for a man who is in earnest, who believes in God, a God with whom he has to do, and knows no more of that God than nature and reason teach him, we can conceive no condition possible but endless unrest and blank despair.

But what of Atheism? Under its prevalence it is demonstrable that utter anarchy must ensue. Atheists may, from various considerations, be kept better than their principles would lead them to be, and especially in a community whose very atmosphere is impregnated with moral ideas which emanate from Christianity. But in Atheism there is no ground laid for any distinction between moral good and moral evil. Murder is no more than the diversion of a few ounces of blood from its former channel; adultery is as good as matrimonial fidelity; theft is but the transference of a quantity of matter from one point of space to another; falsehood is but the putting of a quantity of atmospheric air into a state of vibration. Under such a state of things, the only consolation would be that the world could not long exist, and that the horrid system would speedily work its own cure by the extirpation of the race." ED.

"NO GOD."

"The fool hath said in his heart there is no God."

No God! Then whence derived are we?

No God! How dark our destiny!

Our earthly lot how sad!

There is a God our *manhood* cries;

While vocal "Earth and thundering Skies."

Pronounce the sceptic mad!

SECULARISM.

IN London, some months since, there was formed a "Christian Evidence Committee." Its object is to counteract secularistic activity, which, of late, has been somewhat increased. Last month, at the instance of that committee, a conference took place at the Clarendon Hotel, The Bishop of London presided, and there were present Lords, Clergy, Members of Parliament, Professors, &c. The meeting resulted in a determination to meet the infidel movement by lectures, and largely to use legitimate means to defend the Christian faith. The formation of an association for this purpose was very proper. This is said without admitting the existence of any extraordinary vigour on the part of infidelity. There is a little more noise just now than there has been of late, but the halls and lecturers devoted to the propagation of Infidelity are fewer now than they were, say thirty years ago, when Socialism threatened to destroy Christianity. But it had its "innings" and very soon moved away to the tomb of its ancestors, who in every generation for 1800 years have promised to annihilate the name and faith and work of Christ. Secularism is, of course, Socialism under another name, with its immorality intensified, but not as publicly inculcated. Secularism has its under-ground railway for the conveyance of the most horrid immorality. It is, therefore, the more dangerous for a time, but the mask shall be torn off and the thing shall stand in its own shame and foulness. Apart from its increased filthiness it has nothing to sustain it which the Old Socialism had not. Its leading advocates are neither more learned nor eloquent. They excel in nothing, save a kind of brute force which can unblushingly stand to any lie or slander which may serve their purpose. But the founder of Socialism died believing in a Spiritual World, and others of its most active agents declared themselves Christians. What has been may again be—as with the past leaders so with the present, and, therefore, Bradlaugh and Watts may yet number among the preachers of Methodism.

There is one lesson that cannot be too widely taught—that is, that believers in the Bible can, almost everywhere, by perfectly fair and honourable means, put an end to the public advocacy of Secularism. Refuse to pay their preachers and the work is done. Let believers decline to pay for admission when there is a charge and refuse to give when there is a collection. Where this is done Bradlaugh and Co. will soon cease to travel in that direction, because their own friends will not support them. They know that their gospel is not worth paying for, and they never have been willing to pay their preachers; and as such preachers preach to eke out their living, the machinery comes to a stand when believers refuse to supply cash. This lesson we have inculcated in our lectures with good effect. In Darwen, Bradlaugh had large meetings, and, consequently, a profitable business. On his return after our lectures he found things changed—empty benches were plentiful and money scarce. Darwen will no doubt be speedily given over to remain in Christian darkness. Our lectures at Bury (last month) have been followed by replies, in the same hall, by two men who are announced for Secular Missionary work. A note, just received, tells the result—some sixty people present, collections producing only a few shillings, leaving large loss to be met by the Secularists. In Birmingham the same lesson has been taught, and Bradlaugh cannot get a paying audience, nor can any other; and, consequently, their visits are few and far between. So will it be nearly everywhere if Believers only say "Pay your own preachers; our money shall not be devoted to that purpose."

But though the foe is not so great and powerful as certain good men have come to believe there is activity enough to render it needful to bring out clearly and fully the grounds upon which our faith rests. There has been too much neglect in this direction. We hope to give a fair share of attention to this work, and thus directly, and we trust successfully, contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. We shall respond to invitations to lecture against Secularism and in defence of Christianity, so far as our many other calls will admit; and shall hope to aid the readers of the *B. H.* in the same direction. Our best efforts will be given to solve sceptical difficulties as they may be presented on our pages.

Ed.

CAUSES OF ERROR IN THE INTERPRETATION OF THE BIBLE.

WE pick out a text here and there: whereas, if we take it all together and consider what went before, and what followed after, we should find it meant no such thing—SELDEN: *Table Talk*, p. 20.

It is no wonder if they can accommodate Scripture expressions to their own dreams and fancies; for when men's fancies are so possessed with schemes and ideas of religion, whatever they look on appears of the same shape and colour wherewith their minds are already tintured. ... All the metaphors, and similitudes, and allegories, of Scripture are easily applied to their purpose; and if any word sound like the tinkling of their own fancies, it is no less than a demonstration that that is the meaning of the Spirit of God; and every little shadow and appearance doth mightily confirm them in their preconceived opinions—DR. WM. SHERLOCK: *Knowledge of Christ*, chap. iii. sect. 4, p. 99.

Truth and error, as they are essentially opposite in their nature, so the causes to which they are indebted for their perpetuity and triumph are not less so. Whatever retards a spirit of inquiry is favourable to error; whatever promotes it, to truth. But nothing, it will be acknowledged, has a greater tendency to obstruct the exercise of a free inquiry than the spirit and feeling of a party. Let a doctrine, however erroneous, become a party distinction, and it is at once intrenched in interests and attachments which make it extremely difficult for the most powerful artillery of reason to dislodge it. It becomes a point of honour, in the leaders of such parties, which is from thence communicated to their followers, to defend and support their respective peculiarities to the last; and, as a natural consequence to shut their ears against all the pleas and remonstrances by which they are assailed. Even the wisest and best of men are seldom aware how much they are susceptible of this sort of influence; and while the offer of a world would be insufficient to engage them to recant a known truth, or to subscribe an acknowledged error, they are often retained in a willing captivity to prejudices and opinions which have no other support, and which, if they could lose sight of party feelings, they would almost instantly abandon. ... It is this alone which has ensured a sort of immortality to those hideous productions of the human mind, the shapeless abortions of night and darkness, which reason, left to itself, would have crushed in the moment of their birth—ROBERT HALL: *Terms of Communion*; *Works*, vol. ii. pp. 150-1. See also pp. 151-5.

When I hear ... an ignorant religionist quote an unconnected sentence of half a dozen words from any part of the Old or New Testament, and resting on the literal sense of these words the eternal misery of all who reject, nay, even of all those countless myriads who have never had the opportunity of accepting, this and sundry other articles of faith conjured up by the same textual magic,—I ask myself what idea these persons form of the Bible that they should use it in a way in which they themselves use no other book? They deem the whole written by inspiration. Well, but is the very essence of rational discourse—that is, connection and dependency—done away, because the discourse is infallibly rational?—S. T. COLERIDGE: *Literary Remains*, vol. 1 pp. 320-1.

It is only assumption ... that universality and ubiquity are made the tests of religious doctrine. No universality or ubiquity can make that divine which never was such. It is a mere prejudice of veneration for antiquity, and the imposing aspect of an unanimous acquiescence (if

unanimous it really be) which makes us regard that as truth which comes so recommended to us. Truth is rather the attribute of the few than of the many. The real church of God may be the small remnant, scarcely visible amidst the mass of surrounding professors. Who, then, shall pronounce any thing to be divine truth, simply because it has the marks of having been generally or universally received among men?—HAMPDEN: *Bampton Lectures*, p. 356.

There is, in many minds, a native and almost invincible prepossession in favour of all that is accredited, or ancient, or associated with dignity and high station. It may be a physical propensity;—it may be an intellectual weakness;—it may be a moral sentiment, estimable and virtuous in its affinities, but in itself unintelligent, and liable to much perversion. There is in others a contempt of authority,—a fierce independency of action,—which may be equally injurious when carried to excess.... There is a constitutional churchmanship, and there is a constitutional sectarianism; and they are both equally contemptible and worthless. Our business is to preserve the habits of our mind, to the last practicable extent, free from the perversions of either class, and to follow truth alone wherever it may lead us; making candid allowance for the failings and errors of other men, but using the most vigorous exertions to surmount our own.—DR. M'ALL: *Discourses*, vol. 1. p. 253. See pp. 250-1; vol. ii. pp. 133-4.

There are persons ... who, in supposed compliance with the precept, 'Lean not to thine own understanding,' regard it as a duty to suppress all exercise of the intellectual powers, in every case where the feelings are at variance with the conclusions of reason. They deem it right to consult the heart more than the head; *i.e.* to surrender themselves, advisedly, to the bias of any prejudice that may chance to be present: thus, deliberately and on principle, burying in the earth the talent entrusted to them, and hiding under a bushel the candle that God has lighted up in the mind... I am far from recommending presumptuous inquiries into things beyond the reach of our faculties;—attempts to be 'wise above what is written;'—or groundless confidence in the certainty of our conclusions; but we cannot even exercise the requisite humility in acquiescing in revealed doctrines, unless we employ our reason to ascertain what they are; and there is surely at least as much presumption in measuring every thing by our feelings, passions, and prejudices, as by our own reasonings.—ARCHBISHOP WHATELY: *Essays on the Difficulties in Paul's Writings*, Essay i. § 3, pp. 26, 27.

In the formation of your own opinions ... be independent; use your own reason, your own senses, your own Bible. Be untrammelled; throw off the chains and fetters which compel so many minds to believe only what they are told to believe, and to walk intellectually and morally in the paths marked out for them by human teachers.... Be modest. It is the characteristic of a weak mind to be dogmatical and positive. Such a mind makes up in dogged determination to believe what it wants in evidence. Come to your conclusions cautiously, and take care that your belief covers no more ground than your proofs. Do not dispute about what you do not understand, nor push your investigation beyond the boundaries of human knowledge.—JACOB ABBOTT: *The Corner-stone*, p. 322.

Causes of error in the pursuit of the knowledge of Scripture are:—

1. The want of a critically accurate recension of the *Original Hebrew and Greek Texts*.
2. The want of a thoroughly correct and reliable *translation* of the original texts.

3. The want of a full and correct apprehension of the *usus loquendi* of the Scripture writers.

4. The want of a thoroughly appreciative acquaintance with the *genius* of the writers, and the *character* of the times and persons for whom they wrote.—*Biblical Notes and Queries*.

MINISTRY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.—No. V.

EVANGELISTS.

"Do the work of an Evangelist." 2 Tim. iv. 5.

APOSTLES and Prophets have ceased, because the work for which they were given is finished, and because the Lord does not now, by supernatural gifts, qualify for the prophetic and apostolic office. Without these gifts there can neither be prophet nor apostle; and, hence, we have them not, because, in the very nature of the case, they cannot be had. But with reference to evangelists, pastors, and teachers, it is otherwise. The Lord gave these at the first, and for a time, even as He gave apostles and prophets; that is He qualified for the work, through the Holy Spirit, by direct impartation of fitness. There was this difference between the two classes—all that evangelists, pastors, and teachers were thus qualified to accomplish they could have attained in process of time by the exercise of powers natural to man; while time, application, and natural ability, without supernatural endowment and demonstration, could never develope apostles and prophets. But what is there appertaining to the office of apostle or prophet which could not be acquired by natural processes? Apostles must be witnesses of the resurrection of Christ and demonstrate their apostleship by signs and wonders and mighty deeds. Paul could not have been an apostle had not the Lord *appeared* to him to make him a *witness* of the fact that He was verily living. Prophets speak by inspiration; and inspiration is not acquired but given. Apostles and prophets, then, are considered as gifts, because supernaturally endowed. The same holds good in regard to evangelists, pastors, and teachers, when, by like endowment they are fitted for their office; but not so when fitness results from natural processes and is reached by learning, experience and devotion.

But some there are who insist that evangelists were extraordinary ministers, whose office was temporary. Dr. George Campbell so held. He wrote, "Of this kind evidently was the office of evangelist, a title which, like apostle, fell with those who first enjoyed it. Such was Philip, such was Timothy, such was Titus. The last mentioned, I own, is nowhere expressly called so. But from a proper attention to what we learn concerning him and Timothy, both in the Acts of Apostle's and Paul's Epistles, we find their situations, services, and trusts so perfectly to correspond, that we cannot hesitate a moment in affirming that their functions were the same, and that they both served as assistants to the Apostle Paul." The error of the learned Dr. consists in supposing, that because certain evangelists were deputed by Paul to act for him in places where, by virtue of planting the church, the responsibility of setting in order devolved upon him, that, therefore, all evangelists were in this way deputies of the apostles. But in proof of this assumption there is neither fact nor precept in the whole Bible. Philip, at the time of the persecution, when all save the apostles were dispersed from Jerusalem, went down into Samaria and preached Christ. Men and women hearing and believing were baptized, and, as a matter of course, were formed into a church or

churches as number and locality required. Philip was neither an apostle nor an apostle's deputy. ALL the dispersed disciples went everywhere preaching the Gospel, and they did so on the warrant of their common discipleship. That warrant was enough for each, and nothing in the history suggests that Philip had or needed any other. In going to Samaria he broke up entirely new ground. The Gospel had not been there preached and he did the work of an evangelist, in preaching, baptizing, and setting in order the disciples, without being interfered with by any. To do this he was well qualified, inasmuch as he came from the church in Jerusalem, where he had filled the office of deacon and enjoyed the advantage of seeing the church set in order by the apostles. The apostles did not interfere with his labours except to supplement them in one particular, in which none but an apostle could act—that of ministering the Holy Spirit, by the laying on of hands. Peter and John were sent down that the church in Samaria might by the laying on of their hands receive spiritual gifts. Those apostles did not go to occupy the ground broken up by Philip; having ministered the Spirit to the converts, they returned to Jerusalem, preaching on their way in many villages of the Samaritans. Philip was left to pursue his work in the district into which he had been led. Presently he was directed by the Spirit to go into the desert, and there was effected the conversion of the Ethiopian. From there he was caught away to Azotus, and, then, preaching in all the cities on the way, he came to Cæsarea. In all this there is no trace of his being the agent or representative of any apostle, nor of all the apostles. He was the servant of the Lord, doing the Lord's work, and not the deputy of any man. Cæsarea seems to have become the centre of the district in which he laboured, for there he established his family, and there, in his own house, after, perhaps, twenty years, he entertained the apostle Paul; in the account of which he is spoken of as "Philip the Evangelist."—Acts xxi. 8.

Others have urged that we cannot now have evangelists, because, at the first, they were supernaturally gifted and, therefore, fitted to discharge their important functions without error, and because those gifts are not now given. True, the first evangelists were thus gifted; and so were the first deacons, the first pastors, and the first teachers. In this sense pastors and teachers were as much given (supernaturally endowed) as were evangelists. Yet teachers we must have, so long as it is needful to learn; pastors we must have, so long as there is a flock to feed; evangelists we must have, so long as there are sinners to whom it is needful to preach the gospel. It is nowhere implied, that fitness to preach, baptize, teach, and set in order churches, cannot be obtained otherwise than by supernatural bestowments; nor is it ever hinted, that obtaining the required fitness by miraculous agency was a pre-requisite to the work and designation.

But to discuss whether evangelists continue is to dispute over words rather than things. The designation comes by the transference of a Greek term in place of translating it. Taking that term in the light of its relation to the family of words to which it belongs, nothing appears save that which all admit we have now and must ever have. *Evangelion* and *Evangelizo* stand out for notice when we enquire concerning the signification of *Evangelists*.

Evangelion signifies *good news* or *glad-tidings*. It is found in the New Testament some seventy times; is translated *gospel*, and refers to the good news or glad-tidings of salvation by Christ Jesus.

Good News invites to proclamation—Who would keep Glad Tidings to himself? Hence also we find *evangelizo* used somewhat frequently by the writers of the New Testament. It signifies, to address with good tidings. Rev. x. 7, xiv. 6; to proclaim as good tidings, to announce good tidings of. Luke i. 19. It occurs over fifty times and is generally represented by *preach, preaching, preached*. It is applied alike to persons sent forth to preach the gospel and to those who proclaim it without special appointment. In Romans i. 15, Paul uses it in declaring himself willing "*to preach the gospel*" at Rome; and in Acts viii. 4, it expresses that *preaching* of the word which was participated in by the whole Church, excepting the apostles.

Evangelistees is used in the New Testament only in three instances—once applied to Philip and twice to Timothy. It signifies simply *a bringer of good tidings*, and, in its New Testament usage, one who proclaims, announces, or makes known, the gospel and teaches the things commanded by Christ, to the end that sinners may be converted and disciples congregated into churches and duly set in order. The word does not imply the possession of supernatural powers; nor does it, in the remotest degree, suggest a deputy. It matters not then about the name. Take it away, if you please, but the work remains and also the men who do it.

The installation of evangelists is not anywhere alluded to in Scripture. No mention is made of ordination to that office, because every disciple who does the work of an evangelist to an *extent* to warrant the appellation, is all the name imports; and every disciple who, by personal fitness and providential surrounding, is placed in position so to do is in duty bound to respond. It is not said, that as every disciple at times announces the Gospel therefore every disciple is an Evangelist, for, as while some who occasionally baptize receive not the appellation *Baptist*, John who was devoted to that work was called John *the Baptist*; so only those who do the work of an evangelist over and above every other work, or to the extent requisite to make disciples, set them in congregations, and teach them to observe all thing commanded by the Lord, can be designated evangelists—as, in like manner, the person who occasionally makes a loaf or repairs a garment is not called a baker or a tailor, while those whose business it is largely or chiefly to make bread and garments are thus designated.

The foregoing presents an antidote to priestly pretension. No man can constitute another an evangelist—he who has the gospel may proclaim it—in the workshop, in the parlour, by the roadside, in the public hall, before any company small or large, from any platform or pulpit, and in any way and manner he can command, due regard being paid to the solemnity of the theme and the honor of the Lord.

The apostles were the first evangelists; not however by virtue of apostleship, but on the ground of discipleship. They, therefore, never delivered one sentence limiting preaching, baptizing, planting and setting churches in order to apostles or to persons chosen or ordained by apostles. Paul "conferred not with flesh and blood," but went forth immediately and did the work of an evangelist and, in addition, the work peculiar to an apostle. Philip chosen by the church was ordained to serve tables that others might give themselves to the ministry of the word, but being driven from Jerusalem by persecution he was found with those who went everywhere preaching the gospel and was, therefore, afterwards known as Philip the evangelist. Paul placed Timothy at Ephesus and Titus at Crete to do the work of evangelists, particularly such portion of it as remained to be done ere those churches could be placed in a state of

complete organization. They were to set in order the things that were wanting and ordain Elders in every city.

But here it may be asked why Paul did not set those churches in order before he left them. The answer is, they were not ready. When he sent a brother to do the work of an evangelist by setting in order the wanting things and ordaining elders, his doing that for which he was sent depended upon conditions which he might not find in existence. He was to ordain only brethren possessing certain important qualifications, which cannot be manifested in a newly planted congregation. Elders, it thus appears, are not essential to the *being* but to the *well being* of a church and, till they can be ordained, the over-sight of the church devolves upon the evangelist who planted it, or upon those to whom he may commit it.

Upon this principle it became the duty of Paul to provide for the church in Ephesus. Had that church been planted by Peter or Apollos Paul would have had no right of appointment—as also Peter was without authority to enter upon the field of Paul's labours. As apostles their authority was alike everywhere; for the same decrees were given to each church. As evangelists each possessed his own field and overlooked, till its completion, his own work. It was, then, as an evangelist and not as an apostle that Paul sent Timothy to Ephesus—which sending, however, was not an ordination to evangelistic work—that work was the privilege and duty of Timothy in any and every field he could find unoccupied; and to all churches he might succeed in planting he would stand as an evangelist in the same relation that Paul stood to the church in Ephesus. As an apostle Paul would ever stand above him. The laws of the kingdom were given through the apostles, and to them all must be subservient—as executive ministers, regulated by the decrees of the apostles, evangelists, bishops, and deacons have their own fields of labour and in their respective spheres are equals.

But, would you commit the ordination of elders to one man—should not the church take all responsibility in a matter so important? The church should take nothing which the Lord has not given to it. "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting and ordain elders in every city as I had appointed thee"—thus it was in the churches of Crete. Paul and Barnabas labored as evangelists in Lystra, Iconium, Antioch, and the region round about. Having planted churches they left them not fully set in order, evidently because fitness for oversight had not thus early been manifested. After preaching the gospel in other places and teaching many they returned and confirmed the souls of the disciples—that is to say strengthened them by suitable instruction and help. "And when *they* had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." Thus also it was in Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, and in fact in every church; and, thus it should be with us.

But what is intended by ordination, and who are to be ordained? Exactly that which is brought before us in connection with the table-serving of the first church. The apostles were the first evangelists, and in Jerusalem was the first church planted by them. As instruments used and honored of God in gathering that church they had oversight in every department—they were virtually its first bishops and its first deacons, and the like position belongs to the evangelist in every church he plants. But this arrangement is only temporary. It arises out of the necessity of the case, for who could ordain men, as elders and deacons, who only yesterday confessed the faith. But the evangelist who seeks to retain charge in these

departments,—who neglects to bring Brethren forward so that the oversight which he possesses may be transferred to them, is injurious to the church and unfaithful to the Lord. He who seeks to make his presence a necessity and to settle down as the ONE MAN over the church subverts the order of the Lord's house. Accordingly the apostles, who had in charge the contributions of the brethren, said unto the multitude,—“Look YE out from among yourselves seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom, whom WE MAY APPOINT over this business, but we will give ourselves unto prayers and the ministry of the word.” Now the same word which Paul used when he commanded Titus to *ordain* elders is here translated *appoint*. The multitude look out or choose the men; the apostles *appoint*, *set over*, or *ordain*—that is, they commit, in formal and appropriate manner, to the disciples elected by the multitude, the charge till then held by themselves—and this is precisely the course now to be taken by the evangelist and the church he has been instrumental in planting.

What we have here said upon the ordination of deacons holds good in regard to bishops, with one exception. The number of deacons is limited by the requirement of the church. There may be twenty brethren qualified and you may require but seven, five, or three; and in that case only the wanted number should be elected. But for the bishop's office, election, in the sense of choosing a number from a greater number of qualified brethren, has no existence. The oversight is committed to all the elder brethren who possess certain qualifications and are willing to labour in the important work. They are not, as has been supposed, to put themselves into office on the ground of their own conviction of fitness, but their qualifications having been discerned and declared, they will be *ordained* or *set over* the church by the evangelist; who, by that ordination imparts to them the charge which till then has been in his keeping.

The evangelist may “live of the gospel,” for, even so hath the Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel may live of it. But he, who like Paul, finds it desirable to labor with his own hands, is not on that account less an evangelist. In this great and honorable work those who contribute and those who receive are alike brethren—stewards, helpers in the Lord's enterprise. They never stand in the relation of employer and employed. There is no hirelingism in Christianity. Fellow-helpers in the one great enterprise are all the saints. And just because there is no hirelingism in Christianity—no market for talent—the evangelist has no claim for compensation according to the income he might derive from law, medicine, or trade, relinquished that he might do evangelistic work. He may “*live of the gospel*”—he may have that which the circumstances in which he moves fairly require, and no more. Let him remember that if he surrender earthly riches, home comfort, and many things generally prized, his reward is *double honor*—to be esteemed highly for his work's sake—and, that those who turn many to righteousness will shine, like the stars in the firmament, ages without end.

Upon whom does the support of evangelists devolve? Upon the Brethren. John, writing to his well-beloved Gaius, says, “Beloved, thou doest faithfully whatsoever thou doest to the brethren, and to strangers; which have borne witness of thy charity before the church; whom if thou bring forward on their journey after a godly sort, thou shalt do well; because that for His name's sake they went forth, taking nothing of the Gentiles. We therefore ought to receive such, that we might be fellow-helpers to the truth.” § John v. 8. Here, then, responsibility rests upon every church and upon

every disciple. Not that an evangelist has power to demand, he has only the right to receive. Those who should bestow are the Lord's stewards, not his, and to their own Master they must give an account. If they please to neglect His labor they have the power so to do, but it will not be in their power to escape the reckoning. Questions have been presented concerning collecting and distributing funds for the support of evangelists. Primitive example supplies all that is necessary and leaves every individual a full measure of liberty.

A brother addicted to the work of evangelization journeys from place to place, the churches help him by contributions, derived through the fellowship, or otherwise, as they determine—or this is done by individuals according to ability and readiness of mind. In another instance, a brother labors in a given locality—a church there, or not far distant, may be able and willing to supply his need, or to do so with the help of distant brethren. In such case churches and disciples are at liberty to respond either to the church or to the evangelist. Or it may be that after conference with brethren, an evangelist concludes to labor for the purpose of breaking up new ground. His brethren say—"Give yourself wholly to the work and the Lord will supply you by our hands." In such case individuals and churches can communicate to the evangelist, or, they may (which in many cases is preferable,) appoint messengers to receive contributions; visit the evangelist, or forward from time to time the needed help. In a word—the manner of collecting and distributing is not fixed by divine law and, therefore, any convenient method may be adopted, provided that the liberty of the disciple and that of the church be not interfered with and the church's privilege of supporting the evangelists be not transferred to the world.

And now may the Lord of the harvest send forth laborers into his harvest!
Surely the fields are white and ready!

D. K.

QUERIES AND OBJECTIONS.*

I. On page 80 you seem wise above what is recorded. You say that Jesus did not give the apostles an outline. In what then consisted the preparation which you intimate they were subjected to?

A. SUBSCRIBER.

ANSWER.

We intimated that there was not given during the sojourn of Jesus on earth such an outline of the order and government of the church as enabled the apostles at its commencement to understand that order and government in their entirety. The Holy Spirit was to guide them into all truth, in these and other particulars; and that guiding was not begun and finished in a day. It was vouchsafed as needed. It was seven years before the apostles understood that the Gentiles were to be received into the church in the same way as, and on a perfect footing with, the Jews, and it was still longer before they fully comprehended the requirements concerning circumcision, things strangled, &c. The Saviour, in person, taught them many things concerning the church and thus greatly prepared them for their work, but no such outline was given as enabled them at the first to understand the order and discipline of the church as they did when their labours were brought to a close.

II. Perhaps you will oblige several brethren by placing in a clearer light than your space, perhaps, permitted you to do in your concise paper upon "Apostles," the meaning of the Holy Spirit as to that equivocal expression, "Some, apostles and some, prophets," Eph. iv. 2. Are we to understand "some men," *i.e.* a few of a kind were given; "some churches" only received them, or, that the ability to be evangelists, &c., was bestowed upon certain individuals for the common good?

A. LEARNER.

ANSWER.

Paul asked, in another place, Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? The answer implied is, "No, only *some* are apostles; only *some* are prophets, &c." Jesus gave not apostles to *some* churches or Christians and prophets to *some* others, but He gave "some

* Under this heading will be inserted, from time to time, such enquiries, relating to previous articles of this course, as can be noticed in few words.

apostles" and "some prophets;" that is a few of the former, a larger number of the latter, and also a number of evangelists and pastors. We have shown that the giving consisted in supernaturally qualifying for the respective offices named. They were thus given (few comparatively) for the benefit of the whole of the churches; and the blessed results of those excellent gifts reach down to us, notwithstanding that (as that which is perfect has long since come) the gifts, which were in part, have been done away, and therefore the Lord does not now give prophets, pastors, &c.

THE LIVING WATER.

Weary and thirsty, from long travel under an Eastern sun, the Lord of Life and Glory sat to rest by a well and begged a drink of water of a woman who came to draw. He whose compassion for the weary and hungry multitude led Him to exercise His almighty power to feed them lest they should faint by the way—He whose sympathising heart melted in pity for the poor widow whose only son was being borne to the grave and caused Him to call back the dead to life and restore the young man to his sorrowing mother—now *begs* a drink of water. For the relief of *others* His power was never withheld,—for *Himself* never employed. He is truly a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; tempted in all points like as we are. Oh! loving Saviour what a bond of brotherhood is thus created between thyself and thy loved ones. We can come to thee confidently in *all* our troubles, small and great, knowing well that *thou* canst be touched with the feeling of *our* infirmities.

The woman is surprised that He, a Jew, should ask a favor of her, a Samaritan, considering the hatred and jealousy which had so long existed between the two peoples. But He whose love knows no distinction of race or nation, ever intent on the true welfare of His creatures, yea even a sinful Samaritan woman—seizes the opportunity to point her heavenward. The question of national difference is briefly disposed of. Even His thirst for the time is perhaps forgotten. And at once He tells of the Love of God in the gift of eternal life through His Son.

What a lesson to preachers of the gospel to pass by party differences of opinion on minor questions, and aim above all things to proclaim the Love of God from the heart to the heart.

The gift of God, yes, the *gift*. Oh! the value, in the way of peace and confidence in God, of a true realization of the fact, that eternal life with all its attendant blessings is the *free gift* of God, which no attention to forms and ceremonies; no deeds of benevolence; no sacrifice that man can make; no holiness of life possible on earth can merit, wholly or in part. Before we desired to live a holy life, or felt love for Christ, the great boon had been given—*His* life had been *given* as a ransom for sinners—and the blood bought gift of everlasting life is freely offered to every sinner. Then ought our every effort to glorify our Lord to flow from the motive of pure love and gratitude for His *unspeakable gift*.

But there is something peculiarly precious to the Christian. While on his pilgrimage, a little further on in this interesting narrative, the Saviour said to the woman, "Whosoever drinketh of *this* water shall thirst again, but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life."

Man is continually searching after happiness in a thousand different ways. In pleasures; in fame; in travel; in learning; in affection; in wealth. And he is as continually discovering that he drinks of the cup but to thirst again. Happiness in the things of time must always, like

the sources whence it springs, be transient and *unsatisfying*. Where then can *true* happiness be found? Here is the grand secret, if secret it be, which is so gloriously taught in the word of truth,—that the well; the source; must be *within* (not without) the man. It must not depend on the perishable, and unstable things of the world; but exist independently of worldly circumstances. And this happiness is within the reach of all; thanks be to Him who gives *so* liberally. That water that the Lord will give to those who, knowing the gift of God, ask for it, will be as a spring within them, ever fresh and pure, bubbling up continually until lost in the fulness of eternal happiness. No need to wait till after death for this living water—this soul satisfying gift is for time present. The knowledge of *God in Christ* is the source of this well-spring of happiness; for it embraces the knowledge of sins forgiven, peace with God, and of a reconciled and loving Father, overruling *all things* for good, begetting in the inmost soul love to and confidence in Him, and a hope blooming with immortality. To *know* and *be assured* that we are the special objects of God's love, that *one* soul is of greater value in His sight than a world; to know that all events are in the control of Him who so loved us as to give His life for us and has guaranteed to withhold no good thing from us His upright children; to know that (figuratively speaking) even the very hairs on our heads are numbered; that the angels are ministering spirits to us—and beyond all this, to know that a building of God with blessings for evermore in the midst of all that is lovely and pure awaits us; such confident knowledge is surely sufficient to supply in each Christian, a well spring of peace and happiness springing up continually. The happiest—the most joyous of all men, should the Christian be. If, Brother, you know not what it is to have this "well of water" in you—if you find yourself bemoaning the loss of drops and know not that you have a fountain provided—do not go any longer begging drinks and thirsting again but seek to *know* the gift of God and ask for the water that Christ has to give.

"This is life eternal that they might *know* thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

"These things I have spoken to you that ye might have peace."

Consider *Him*! Seek to know more of *Him* in His word in daily communion; in daily mercies; in every event in life; in sickness; in health; in poverty; in wealth; trace His loving hand in all things; watch as well as pray; make Him your adviser, your brother, your companion; let Him share your joys and troubles, that your *confidence* may be in *Him* and the *peace* of God, which passeth all understanding, shall be in you as a well spring of water.

"In the world ye shall have tribulation." Can there then be happiness in tribulation? Yes, for the peculiarity of the peace that the Lord gives is that it is not *from* but *in* trouble; trials without, peace within; a supply equal to the demand. Peace which passeth knowledge enabling the afflicted to leave his troubles for a time, and mount as on eagle's wings to the throne of mercy and find grace to help in every time of need.

Lord give us this water that we thirst not.

W. H. EVANS.

THE first question, as it seems to me, a Christian man constrained to enter into controversy with a brother should ask himself, is this: How small can I make the difference between us? On how many points do we agree? On how few do we differ? Were this honestly done, the number of our controversies would be much diminished, and the tone of such as must still be maintained much modified.

WORDS FROM THE WORK TABLE.—No. XXXI.

"From all that hath been lost,
And all that yet remains, our hearts may learn
Some profitable lessons."

WOMAN's influence is coeval with the creation. First exercised in Eden it brought death upon all generations. Since then, woman has exercised for evil or for good an influence the wide world over. From Carthage, Greece, Sparta, Rome—nay, from every empire and on every shore, has her impress come down to us who live in the days of gospel light and liberty. Woman is most faithfully presented to our contemplation in the several eras of Bible history, so that any true woman can find in the sacred page a revelation of herself and incentives to good and a warning against evil. Such being the case, it may be both useful and interesting to glance at some of the scenes sketched for our edification on the pages of holy writ.

EVE.

Eden in all its beauty expands before us ; its unclouded sky, its emerald carpet, its shady bowers ; and its splendid foliage—

"Hill, dale, and shady woods, and sunny plains, •
And liquid lapse of murmuring streams ; by these,
Creatures that liv'd and mov'd, and walk'd, or flew,
Birds on the branches warbling ; all things smiled
With fragrance."

in that spot, the beauty of which requires even a more powerful pen than that of Milton to describe. But we can sum up all in Bible language—"God saw every thing that He had made and behold it was *very good*."

We behold Adam traversing its flowery walks, gazing in silent rapture at its magnificent scenery, calling the living creatures by name, but finding none among them to fill the void within him. The lordly lion, the handsome tiger, the gentle gazelle, doubtlessly pleased his eye, but gave not the sympathy his nature craved. There was not found a help-meet for him. Jehovah knew that it was "not good for man to be alone;" but Adam must feel the need himself ere God supplies the remedy, and He tests him by causing the animal creation to pass before him to receive their names, and as they passed in pairs Adam would keenly feel his isolation.

A deep sleep fell upon him, during which the Creator made (builded) the desired companion, and presently presented his lovely bride.

Thus God sanctified marriage and gave to woman her right position—"help meet" for man.

"Adam, behold
Thy likeness, thy fit help, thy other self,
Thy wish exactly to thy heart's desire."

What an awakening from sleep was that! And what a comprehensive marriage covenant—"This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother and shall cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh." How completely is the idea of *oneness* set forth. "The essential unity and higher wholeness of man in man and wife." In his wife man receives, what no help or friendship however fair it might be could possibly have given him, *one heart and one soul*.

Here is portrayed the fairest scene that earth ever beheld, or will behold until that time when the New Jerusalem shall come from above, when once again sin, misery, and death shall have no place. But this scene too soon passed away.

"Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, we may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden. But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."

Eve stands in a perilous position, parleying with a subtle enemy who cautiously seeks to excite doubt as to what God had said, awaken mistrust in His goodness, and then boldly to give the lie to His word as to the result of disobedience. "Ye shall not surely die." This should at once have satisfied Eve that wrong was intended. How could she look around upon the beauty everywhere smiling upon her and doubt the veracity of the Being who had placed her there.

Mark the progress of sin. She *listened*, she *pondered*, she was *attracted* to the tree; she *plucked and ate*.

Here we see the gratification of what the apostle designates "*The desire of the flesh*"—the tree was good for food; "*The desire of the eye*"—it was pleasant to the eyes; "*The pride of life*"—it was a tree to be desired to make one wise. Wisdom is decidedly desirable; but wisdom on unlawful subjects unlawfully gained becomes a curse to the possessor. So Eve found it. Sin is ever delusive, promising good,

"Like Dead Sea fruit, which tempts the eye,
But turns to ashes on the lip."

Eve tempted, becomes the tempter: she "did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat." The record of Eve's life is very brief. Many points in her history are passed over that we would fain have dwelt upon. We have no account of how she induced her husband to disobey his Creator: we are left to conjecture. Did the recollection of the expressive declaration—"Therefore shall a man cleave unto his wife and they shall be one flesh"—come upon him in the moment of temptation and lead him to accept death with her in preference to existence without her? We know not, it may have been so. Adam was *persuaded* to eat, he did not eat doubting God's veracity. Paul tells us "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." He must then have yielded to her influence. How keenly must she have felt this, when fully aware of the loss she had sustained? How much her punishment must have been aggravated by the consciousness of having led her husband into sin; and how sorely must she have felt the diminution of respect manifested in Adam's reply to the question of Jehovah—"Hast thou eaten of the tree?" "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree and I did eat." Upon these points the sacred page gives no response. It tells us of her temptation and her fall, and leaves us to imagine her penitence. That she acknowledges her fault clearly and without extenuation we do learn—"The serpent beguiled me and I did eat." Adam in acknowledging his transgression had endeavoured to throw off the responsibility by laying the blame on Eve, then by implication on God. Instead of showing himself the protector and guide of woman he, in a manner, renounced dignity by denouncing her. God, before pronouncing sentence upon Adam, holds up this sin to his view and tacitly rebukes the endeavour to exculpate himself—"Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake!"

But in neither confession is there a proper confession of sin. Their eyes were opened so that they perceived their degradation, but they did not see the sinfulness of sin and, consequently, sought to excuse their disobedience. So is it still with their posterity; few confess their own sin, but continually frame excuses for their conduct and seek to extenuate their crimes. The sinner in order to be saved must take home the sin and plead—"guilty, Lord! verily guilty! Then and then only is there pardon."

But there was consolation for the wounded heart of Eve. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." She who had been first in the transgression, which was to shed its baleful blight over generations as yet unborn, was to be the means of introducing a deliverer, and that without man's participation. (A virgin shall conceive and bear a son; and shall call his name Immanuel). Our first parents would apprehend enough of God's promise to cause a ray of hope to illumine their darkened path; they would not be able to look right down the stream of time to the One seed who was to destroy the power of death, but they were enabled to trust God's word and to lean confidently upon His mercy.

"And Adam called his wife's name Eve," thus, as it were, looking over the announcement of death to the word of promise respecting the seed of the woman. In the very face, therefore, of the death, with which he is threatened, the wife is for Adam a security, as well for the continuance as for the victory of his race; and there is, therefore, a laying hold of the promise and of the grace, in the midst of wrath and with a consciousness of death incurred; in a word it is by an act of faith that Adam names his wife Eve—life.

Being unfitted, through sin, to dwell longer in Paradise, they were sent out from it to till the earth, which was to bring forth thorns and thistles. And, lest they should take of the tree of life and live for ever, God drove them out and placed a guard over the tree of life. Here closes the history of "paradise lost." The hope of a "paradise regained" is the one bright star shining in the dark night.

Can we not imagine Eve's emotion as she passes the confines of that delightful spot she was never again to tread? Can we not hear her murmur—

"Farewell ye blissful bowers!
Alas, alas, that I must say farewell,
And breathe no more your atmosphere of flow'rs,
Nor 'midst your glories dwell!

O, I would linger here
On your green threshold, if I might no more,
'Till death, my portion now, should come to bear
Me to his viewless shore!

I go, a world accurs'd
By mine own act, in bitterness to tread;
But o'er that thought—the darkest, saddest, worst—
Mercy hath balsam shed!

Hush then, my grief-torn heart,
Thy throbbings wild—thine agony subdue—
In faith and hope, if not in peace, depart—
Ye blissful bowers, adieu!"

We have yet to contemplate Eve in another aspect. "She bare Cain (gain, acquisition,) and said, I have gotten the man-child, the Lord." But her happiness was but short-lived. What agony must have been her's

as she gazed upon Abel's lifeless body! Hapless mother! doubly bereaved! The dead son and the living one alike separated from thee! Oh, sin! how ghastly must thou have appeared to Adam and to Eve as they looked upon their murdered son and reflected upon their own disobedience!

Notwithstanding these severe trials Eve's faith in God's promise is firm: though disappointed in Cain, deprived by death of Abel, nevertheless when again she became the mother of a son she "called his name Seth (compensation), for God, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel whom Cain slew." She looked upon him as security for the fulfillment of the promise of a deliverer.

With this announcement the record concerning Eve closes. No account of her death, no mention of her age, though we learn that Adam had sons and daughters after Seth, and that he lived nine hundred and thirty years, and he died. Whether Eve passed away long before him we learn not. But from her history we do learn that woman's influence is a mighty power for good or evil. And we also learn, that the violation of God's laws is fraught with disappointment, misery, and death; that sin is ever delusive, promising good but ending in shame and remorse—

"It dims the eye;
It dulls the inner ear;
It dazzles, and it darkens, and it blinds,
It worketh awe and fear.

It worketh wrath,
And woe, and want, and doom;
It leads us darkly to the second death,
The everlasting tomb."

The only way to escape its pollution is to turn a deaf ear to the voice of the tempter, and to flee at once from the temptation; overcoming all worldly allurements by a wise use of the Word of God. It was thus that Jesus withstood the tempter. Let us follow our great exemplar.

Another lesson to be drawn from Eve's history is, "that the wisdom alone worth seeking is that which the Lord giveth; out of His mouth cometh knowledge and understanding, He layeth up sound wisdom for the righteous; He is a buckler to them that walk uprightly, He keepeth the paths of judgment and preserveth the way of His saints."

Every doubt of God's goodness and truthfulness was evidently removed from Eve's mind. We have no account of Adam's feelings after their expulsion from Eden; but we have some insight in regard to Eve from her expressions at the birth of her sons. That she had full faith in God's promise is manifested by her joy at Cain's birth. And, though sorely wounded in her motherly relation, yet at the birth of Seth there was no desponding—she received him as taking the place of Abel and looked upon him as given by God as "another seed." This clinging to God's word is the point for our imitation. Through trial, disappointment and difficulty may we ever take up the strain of the Prophet Habakkuk—"Although the fig-tree shall not blossom, neither fruit in the vines; the labour of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat; the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and no herd in the stalls: yet will I rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation. The Lord God is my strength."

LOUISE.

Birmingham.

THE HIGHER PANTHEISM: BY A. TENNYSON. WITH
A SUPPLEMENT: BY G. GREENWELL.

THE HIGHER PANTHEISM.

THE sun, the moon, the stars, the seas, the hills and the plains—
Are not these, O Soul, the vision of Him who reigns?
Is not the vision He? tho' He be not that which He seems?
Dreams are true while they last, and do we not live in dreams?
Earth, these solid stars, this weight of body and limb,
Are they not sign and symbol of thy division from Him?
Dark is the world to thee: thyself art the reason why;
For is He not all but thou, that hast power to feel 'I am I'?
Glory about thee, without thee; and thou fulfillest thy doom,
Making Him broken gleams, and a stifled splendour and gloom.
Speak to Him thou for He hears, and spirit with spirit can meet—
Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.
God is Law, say the wise; O Soul, and let us rejoice,
For if He thunder by law the thunder is yet His voice.
Law is God, say some: no God at all says the fool;
For all we have power to see is a straight staff bent in a pool;
And the ear of man cannot hear, and the eye of man cannot see;
But if we could see and hear, this Vision—were it not He?

SUPPLEMENT FROM CHRISTIAN THEISM.

The vision is grand and fair, from the stars to the solemn sea,
From the cornfields waving gold to the silver upon the lea;
From the mountains crowned with light, to the rosebush in the dene';
No language may declare how glorious the seen.
The *thoughts* of God shine forth in the robe and vail of light,
Which reveal eternal power—but hide the person from sight.
But the Workman is not the *work* nor is His work a *dream*,
Or man would be PHANTOM-SEER among the things that *seem*.
The starry heavens *without* and the moral law *within*
Speak of One who has power, and One who will visit sin.
But had we no finer light than that upon sea and shore,
The men who lie down to sleep might pray to awake no more!
For iron law drives on—and however we sigh or moan—
Never a word of pardon, or of mercy-seat by the throne.
The Sphinx has awful beauty, but her stony lips are sealed,
And if *she has* a secret it is never to us revealed.
Not from morning star, or light of the regal sun,
Can mortal ever learn how his work on earth should be done.
No winds which rifle spice-fields, or tempests as they rave,
Proclaim the Resurrection of dead men from the grave.
Cry not for strength in the field or the forest dim,
Or where old ocean lifts her weird and fathomless hymn;
Not among rocks of Eld or lamps of the dome on high
Can we learn the solemn lessons of how to live or to die.
The visible Temple glooms with funeral crape on the gates,
And her priests, silent all, are dead as the heathen fates.
But there is One who speaks with authentic voice and clear,
Of forgiveness and of life, and of love conquering fear.
Cleansed in His fountain, quickened by His Spirit,
Divinely we arise the kingdom to inherit.

The children of light in the charm of perfect love ;
See the City of God which descendeth from above.
The halls and streets of the golden—the river of higher life—
Can suffer no defilement, and see no human strife.
And so we look to the Orient, where light and life were born,
For the Sunrise supreme of the resurrection morn.
From higher fields of light, where suns without number shine,
To the rocks of our underworld—the vision how divine !
On olden azure sea the ships of the heavens advance,
The fleet of God sails on (are we all in a solemn trance?).
No stormy darkness there, nor crash upon iron coast,
From yon vast argosies a vessel has never been lost ;
In music and light they move—tempest and shipwreck unknown,
For the ether sea has rest, by law from the Central Throne.
But whence and whither they sail, no son of earth can declare.
Our emerald fields on earth are beautifully fair ;
The stones of fire lie hid in the crypts of darkness old,
And man brings up to light rubies and dust of gold.
But richer the blowing rose, or cedar of Lebanon grand,
Born from the mother soil without the labour of hand ;
In the mystic force of life which mortal may never know,
Whether we wake or sleep the corn and the palm tree grow.
Were it our privilege now to recline in the summer woods,
Or dream on Paradise slopes by melodious silver floods,
The school would not nurture men as lords of the higher age,
When forces of sin and death have spent themselves in rage.
With iron soil, keen blast and spectres in the path,
With pestilence and fire and terrible shapes of wrath,
We fight in a Holy War, to be crowned in the golden prime
With glory, honour, and power, triumphal and sublime.
Surely, O Soul, there is One “ in all, through all, above all,”
Whose voice we shall hear, when tempests have wasted their brawl,
Whose face we shall see, when the shadows have all fled away !
And the lamps are eclipsed in the light of His sevenfold day.
And if His outer court be rich, and His woven robe so fine,
HIMSELF from the Pavilion, how glorious, how Divine !
True, there are wastes on earth of frost and devouring fire,
Deserts of burning sands and swamps of evil mire ;
Tropical jungles rank where dire malaria steams,
And life in death resembles the wildest opium dreams.
True, there is ground so bad that sunshine falleth in vain,
Useless the holy light—the dew, the descending rain,
And winds of ruin blow—moaning in wizard night,
Which bring from rotten marshes the pestilence and blight.
True, there are forms of life most revolting and obscene,
Fierce, hideous and deformed—terrific and unclean ;
Regions where darkness dread—maintains the Anarch reign—
But how can it be otherwise while nature travails in pain ?
The shapes of wrath are types shadowy of human woe,
Prophetic of man's ruin—since he with shattering blow
Smote his own throne and life with such a cruel thrust,
And put his golden crown and purple into the dust !
The man who turned away from his Lord in unholy pride,
Could surely never dream that his Eden would abide—

For while he makes the rivers run red with human blood,
And pours forth defilement coarse as the wintry flood ;
It is fitting that his overthrow crop out on every hand,
In fierce creatures of the sea, of the slime and of the land.
But sure as God liveth ! shall inviolate peace return,
And over all creation the primal glory burn.
The darkness may increase—but we approach the holy day,
When splendour from the Orient shall chase the glooms away ;
Not the horns of elf-land heard in the Poet's trance,
Or silver trumpets blown in his forest of romance ;
But the harps of mighty angels, the sounding of their wings
Are over us and round us as they sweep the trembling strings,
Their Lord and ours—the Prince of life and love,
Is ready to descend from pavilion above.
What voice is that we hear?—The winter is gone past,
The summer time of glory is surely come at last ;
The turtle's voice is heard—the fountains are in play,
Arise, my love, my fair one ! Arise and come away.

Reviews, Notes, Passing Events, &c.

TEACHINGS OF EXPERIENCE; OR LESSONS I HAVE
LEARNED ON MY WAY THROUGH LIFE. By JOSEPH BARKER,
London. Beveridge.

A MAN who has seen some sixty summers; who has laboured much and travelled far on both sides the Atlantic; who has preached the gospel, lectured against the gospel, and returned again to preaching; who has made believers and made infidels—may, certainly, be expected to have it in his power to publish, under the above title, a book worth reading and likely to be useful to those who are willing to profit by the experience of others.

That Joseph Barker, as a preacher, exercised large influence is very well known; that, afterwards, as an infidel lecturer, he was as powerful against the faith as any who have

taken the field, will be admitted by those competent to judge who heard him. People who know something of his changes, not unnaturally, ask, how he came to get away from faith in the Bible and how, after such decided opposition, he returned to that faith? The book, of course, should answer this question, and it does so. Not that it gives quite all that is desirable, nor all that we consider to be due. Still very much is said and, taking it as a whole, its influence will be for good. Indeed, we recommend its circulation, and shall gladly see it in the hands of persons newly added to the church.

EXTRACT FROM THE LIFE OF A. CAMPBELL.

Among other points, Mr. Campbell was to visit Lexington, which, in a literary point of view, was, at this period, regarded as the "Athens of the West." Transylvania University was now in a most flourishing condition under the presidency of Dr. Horace Holley, a fine classical scho-

lar, and greatly admired as an orator in a community passionately fond of oratory, and which possessed such men as Clay, Crittenden, Barry, Rowan, S. P. Sharp and Ben. Hardin. As Dr. Holley was a man of popular manners and liberal principles, the University had risen rapidly in public

esteem, and was filled with students from the South and West in all its departments—its school of medicine, which then numbered among its professors Charles Caldwell and B. W. Dudley, being regarded as second only to the Philadelphia medical institutions. Lexington could also at this time boast of one of the ablest literary periodicals of the West, edited by William Gibbs Hunt.

Mr. Campbell was to preach in the capacious meeting-house used by the Baptist church in charge of Dr. Jas. Fishback. The doctor was a man of superior talents, elegant manners and remarkably fine personal appearance, being far above the ordinary height, well proportioned and with dark hair and regular and expressive features. He had fine didactic powers—was a close reasoner, and independent and somewhat original in his way of thinking. He had been once a successful practitioner of law, but abandoned this for the study of medicine, which, however, he soon left for the Presbyterian ministry. Becoming afterward convinced that immersion was the proper action denoted by "baptism," he did not hesitate to unite with the small and condemned Baptist church at Lexington, which, by means of his zeal, energy and ability, soon became one of the largest, most active and prosperous churches in the West. He had published, some time before, a work on the human mind, which displayed unusual power of thought, and was considered a valuable contribution to mental science. He thus occupied a very high position, not only among the Baptists, but in the intelligent and cultivated society of Lexington, before which Mr. Campbell was now to appear, a comparatively unknown stranger, from an obscure creek, called Buffalo, among the silent hills of Western Virginia.

At the hour of meeting the house was crowded to its utmost capacity. When Mr. Campbell rose, he appeared pale and exhausted, owing to the

dyspepsia from which he had not yet fully recovered, and was unable to stand entirely erect during the delivery of his discourse. This was based on the first chapter of Hebrews and led the speaker to dwell upon the divine glory of the Son of God—a theme upon which he was always surpassingly eloquent. It lasted two hours, during which the audience sat in rapt attention. Dr. Theodore S. Bell, now a distinguished physician of Louisville, but then a youth, was present, and thus speaks of it:

"I never had heard anything that approached the power of that discourse, nor have I ever heard it equalled since. Under the training of my mother, one of the most thorough scholars in the Bible that I ever knew, and of Dr. Fishback, although I then made no pretensions to Christianity, I was almost as familiar with the Bible as with my alphabet. But that speech on Hebrews lifted me into a world of thought, of which I had previously known nothing. It has been forty-five years since I heard that pulpit discourse, but it is as vivid in my memory, I think, as when I first heard it."

The impression made upon the entire audience was very marked. They recognized at once in Alexander Campbell the mightiest intellect that had ever visited their city. The freshness of his thoughts, the extent and accuracy of his biblical knowledge, and his generalizations of the wonderful facts of redemption opened up trains of reflection wholly new, and presented the subject of Christianity in a form so simple and yet so comprehensive as to fill every one with admiration. Nor were they less struck with the perfect ease with which he developed and illustrated the most profound and enlarged conceptions, seemingly by an inexhaustible interior power, unaided by the slightest gesture or any of the arts of elocution. Nor did this unassuming, humble and unobtrusive

deportment in the social circles of the most eminent citizens whom he met, especially in the elegant mansion where Dr. Fishback and his amiable Christian lady dispensed a munificent hospitality, make a less favorable impression; so that from this time forward Mr. Campbell was esteemed by the people of Kentucky as great among the greatest of her public men, and without a rival in the department to which he had devoted his powers. The consideration

which he thus received from the intelligent citizens of Kentucky, their genial hospitality, and frank and simple manners, so accordant with his own, made a deep impression upon him, and he was wont always to speak in the most feeling terms of the kindness and love shown him by the people of Kentucky, whom he often visited in after years, and among whom the reformatory principals soon became very widely diffused.

H. S. EARL AND THE EDITOR.

H. S. EARL forwards for insertion in the *B. H.* a copy of a letter to the *American Christian Review*, dated Dec. 2, which letter up to the time of this writing has not appeared in that paper. The letter is a reply to our former answer to his attack upon our letter to the Disciples in America, so far as it incidentally referred to his public renunciation of the opinion he held upon communion when he came to this country, &c. Now it is always painful to refuse to allow a party concerned to say all he wishes to say, but still, in view of the public good, we are compelled, at present, to decline the greater part of said letter, as it would fill some seven or eight pages and render needful as many more for comment. Thus our readers would have some sixteen pages of mere personal dispute, and they have determined not to circulate a paper characterized by that kind of thing. Then its insertion would do no one any good, not even H. S. E., while it would annoy our subscribers generally; and then, too, the important points are really settled.

Putting, then, aside the bulk of the letter, there remain some two or three items upon which H. S. E. is entitled to be heard, and on these we shall cite his words. But here, of course, he would deny that, as a party concerned, we are competent to decide how far he should be heard. Now this we admit, and,

therefore, will not take the responsibility of deciding, excepting so far as the *present* issue of the *B. H.* is concerned. His entire letter shall be sent to the General Evangelist Committee, and if they deem that justice to him requires, or that good can accrue from, its appearing, then the remainder shall at once have place in our pages. This we think will satisfy all reasonable brethren, including H. S. E., unless, indeed, he belong not to the reasonable class.

It will be remembered that we alluded to his having introduced an unbaptized relative for fellowship in the Camden Town Church. This he denied, absolutely. It was explained that we did not mean that the introduction was by letter or by direct application, and testimony was cited to the effect that he *did* bring said relative into the seats set apart for members, and was disappointed, &c., that permission to commune was not afforded. Now, in the letter just to hand, we have his own account of the transaction, thus—

The following are simply the facts of the case, so far as I remember. On Lord's day morning I started in company with my mother to Camden Hall—a distance of about four miles from the relatives whom we were visiting. We had some difficulty in finding the place, and when we entered the Hall the service had commenced. I took a forward seat, but mother took a seat at the back, and on the opposite side to that occupied by myself. Just before "breaking

bread" Br. Ludbrook came to me and asked me if I was a brother. I replied I was, and handed him my letters of introduction and commendation, which were then read to the Church. I was asked by the same brother whether the lady who came in with me was a baptized believer; I answered, No. After the meeting closed I learned that my mother had *not* *communed*. It appeared she had intended to, but was passed, and she felt somewhat grieved, and had some conversation with Sister Harris about it. I also was surprised at the course pursued, and expressed myself freely about it to Br. Harris and others, stating to them that she *sometimes* met with the Brethren in America, and when she wished to commune she was never debarred. Now how D. King, or anybody else, can make an "introduction to commune" out of these facts I am at a loss to conceive (for remember she never met with the Church in Camden Town after this morning). Indeed, the person who could do so could also prove that black was white, or any other contradiction.

We are quite willing to accept the above statement as substantially correct. We still deem it an introduction for the purpose of fellowship. The lady would not have gone there had he not taken her; she had no connection with the people and, not being permitted to commune, never went again. She expected to commune, was grieved at not doing so, and made that known after the meeting; when he, also, was "*surprised*," and "*expressed his mind pretty freely about it*." Had he written exactly what he then said we should have a little more light upon the subject. Now the fellowship would have been had as a consequent of his introducing the lady had it not been refused, and being so we felt, and still feel, justified in speaking of it as we did. But the *facts* are now stated, and the reader can judge whether the term "*introduced*" was justifiable or not, and there can be no need for us to spoil paper in discussing it. Certainly had we supposed that H. S. E. would have objected to the term it would not have been used.

The next item is our intimation that in the Leicester meeting he

publicly renounced the opinion which he held when he came to this country. To this he answered, "*This statement is incorrect. I made no public renunciation of anything. Surely D. K. has been drawing largely upon his imagination for facts.*" Our answer to this and to other things stated as done at the meeting, but denied by H. S. E., was not in the form of hair-splitting argument, but in the shape of *sevenfold* testimony from disinterested witnesses, who were present and heard the things he denies. These witnesses included the president of the meeting and six other well known brethren. And seven others, or twice seven, could be immediately added. We say then, that the matter is *settled* by ample and reliable witnesses and, therefore, placed beyond the limits of discussion. But as H. S. E. now undertakes to tell what did take place in regard to said change of opinion it is due that his statement appear, and then the point will be doubly settled. He writes thus—

We shall now consider D. K's proof for his *fifth* mis-statement. "He therefore *publicly renounced* the errors he had acquired from you." My denial was "*I made no public renunciation of anything.*" I have read over carefully D. K's 10th letter and it appears to me, that some of the brethren who have written to him have mistaken what I wrote on this mis-statement. They seem to think that *I denied having changed my mind on the communion question*. Now I denied no such thing. The question was *not about having changed my views on that subject*, (for this I freely acknowledge) but that *I publicly renounced* the error. But says Br. Evans one of D. K's witnesses "*It was announced to the meeting in his presence that the investigation had resulted in his concluding that the practise of the American Churches could not be maintained without surrendering the fundamental principle of the Reformation, and that he therefore relinquished his former opinions.*" This is quite true (although I had forgotten the fact that D. King had made the statement to the meeting, when I wrote my letter to the *Review*, but some time after it came to my remembrance) but even this fact could not justify, in my judgment, the statement of D. King, that *I publicly renounced* the error. He must *first* either

prove that *I personally publicly renounced the error or else that I authorized some one to do it for me*, which I feel assured he cannot do. In order that you may see the matter in the clearest light I shall lay before you the facts in the case as they are in my memory. After the discussion of the communion question on Tuesday, I had a private conversation on the subject with some brethren. In the evening before dusk I was requested to talk the matter over with some brethren in a private room, which I did, and after considerable conversation I candidly and frankly told them, that their views were more in harmony with the sacred word, and that my mind was changed upon the subject. They appeared pleased, and just as we were leaving the room, one of them asked me whether I had any objection to the Brethren knowing my change of mind. I answered not in the least. The next morning to my surprise *Br. King announced it to the meeting* and at the conclusion asked me, *if his statement was correct*. To which I answered *Yes*. Now I ask did D. K. *do me justice, or state correctly*, when he wrote "He publicly renounced the error," I do not think he did. In my judgment it was taking an undue advantage of circumstances, and not correctly detailing the facts as they actually transpired. He may have thought that he had *permission to publicly renounce for me*, but *I gave him no such permission*. I simply gave permission for my change of views to be told *privately and not publicly*.

Now note the facts, as stated by H. S. E.—He renounced his former opinion in a private room to a company of brethren—he was then asked whether he objected to the brethren being made acquainted with his change of view, and he answered, "*Not in the least*"—the next morning, in the public meeting, D. K. made the brethren acquainted with said change. This was done in the presence of H. S. E., and, that there might be no mistake, he was asked whether the facts had been rightly stated *and he answered "Yes."* What, in the name of common sense, then could have moved him to write that he made "*No renunciation of anything?*" But he says he did not authorize the telling of the fact in public and intended that it should be told only in private. He was simply asked whether he objected to "*the brethren*" knowing of his change. Now "*the brethren*" would mean of

course, the brethren who had then assembled in that town and who had postponed the discussion upon his case till a subsequent sitting. He declared that he had not the least objection to their being informed and gave no hint of confining his permission to private communications nor of his even preferring the same; nor did he utter one word of complaint to D. King, either in or after the meeting, as to the manner in which he had made it known. But had D. K. misunderstood the permission to make known the change that would not alter the fact that it was *publicly* made known; nor could it blot out the fact that by his own "*Yes*," *publicly* uttered, *he*, himself, made public confession of the change. But is it not a shame to waste the time of our readers by having thus to write? May we never have the like to do again.

H. S. E. complains sorely that we have done wrong by not confessing the great fault committed by alluding to him as one who "laboured in *England* over a year," whereas he laboured in *England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales* over two years and nine months. We did not reply to this because it was not considered of any importance. His exact statement of the time was published. But that does not suffice—he tells it all over again, and cites dates from the *B. H.* to prove his statement, and thinks that with a memory that could not discern between over one year and above two years and nine months we can scarcely be relied upon on other points. But the fact is, that there was not a single item in all our letter that was in the least affected by the time of his sojourn here. Allusion to it was only made because his name was not mentioned. He was alluded to as an evangelist then in Australia, but who had been here between leaving America and arriving there. Now this description would have applied to three other

evangelists, but they had only preached here a few times and, merely to prevent any from supposing that one of those was alluded to, we threw in the intimation that he laboured in England more than one year. Take away the time spent in Scotland, Ireland, and Wales (or even without that reduction) the intimation was near enough for the purpose, and nothing else in the letter was affected thereby. It has not yet been proved that thirty-three months is not more than one year.

One point more, which has no reference to our first letter, but arose out of H. S. E.'s last printed reply. He puts it thus—

"I deem it my duty to prove a statement of my letter which D. K. *denies* in the following words—'But his better fare was not owing to the increased liberality of the brethren, nor to the generosity of the good brother in South Australia, whom by mentioning he seeks to honor, for that good brother's generous donations were expended by the general committee, from whose fund his increased support was not derived.'"

H. S. E. proceeds to show that "his better fare" *was* due to the increased liberality of the brethren, and to that end cites the yearly contributions to the Evangelist Fund, showing increase in the later years. It would answer no purpose to print the figures, because we admit the increased contribution, which is all the figures can possibly prove. But we know that that increase was not the result of enlarged liberality, as in the earlier years the like amount was not had only because the committee did not need it. There are no figures in print by which the ability and liberality of the brethren

in this country can be determined.

On the second point H. S. E. is more successful. He *proves* that "His better fare" was, in some measure, owing to the donations of the brother in South Australia, which we thought there was good data for not admitting. He cites from letters, written by one who is no longer on this side the tomb, showing that there was a disposition of money consequent upon his application for permission personally to dispose of it, which we had no reason to suspect. The letters cited were certainly written as strictly private epistles and we are satisfied would not have been written had publication been expected, and they could not be made public without calling forth remarks that would be painful, at least to some. Still they may appear in the *A. C. Review*; but in that we shall have no hand. We are glad that our ability to withdraw the saying they are cited to disprove removes all reason for their appearance here. We admit then, that latterly, while in this country, H. S. E. was aided (though not through the Committee) by money donated from Australia. After reviewing the whole matter this is the only point upon which we see room to modify our statements; while the contents of our first letter is fully substantiated. We shall send the entire correspondence to the General Committee and request their conclusion as to whether justice to H. S. E. requires the publication of the whole or any further part of his epistle.

D. K.

KNOCKS AND LOVE-TAPS.

It is essential to the life and growth of the human body that it should be regularly supplied with nourishing food—that which might be termed (in all its variations, according to circumstances,) the

"Daily Bread" of mankind. Delicacies and dainties may be added, and, rightly used, contribute much to enjoyment and somewhat to the nourishment of the body; but they *cannot take the place* of our "daily

bread" without injury to the system—some, indeed, cannot partake of dainties at all.

With equal truth may it be said of the spiritual nature of man, that it is essential to its growth in the divine life that it be supplied with nourishing food—practical teaching; words in season, provocatives to love and good works, exhortations, encouragement, comforting, strengthening—which may be well termed the "daily bread" teaching; inasmuch as it is calculated to prepare us to meet the daily trials and temptations of the present life by giving daily strength. Delicacies and dainties in the nature of, *e.g.*, attempts at unfolding the dark sayings of Scripture and discussions of nice points wherein the opinions of brethren widely differ, may afford much enjoyment, and perhaps contribute to the nourishment of the spirit, but they can *never supply the place* of the more substantial "daily bread." Some, indeed, cannot take them without injury. Both the "daily bread" and the "delicacies," however, are good in their place, and in proper proportion.

Will this hint be taken as it is given, with all respect and in love, by those talented brethren whose able contributions so often appear in the *B. H.* A little more from the "daily bread" store, (even if it be at the expense of losing some of those delicacies which are so like what have been termed "passages at arms," where at times blows rather harder than "love-taps" have been given and received), would prove of advantage to our spiritual life. This, however, by the way, I have been prompted to write thus by hearing brethren express a wish that the *B. H.* did not contain so much contention between brethren, as they are thereby prevented from sending it to friends whom otherwise they might instruct by so doing.

W. H. E.

REMARKS.

The *B. H.* is not characterized by contention between brethren. Indeed it is singularly free from that kind of thing. But what are we to understand by contention? There are interesting subjects upon which we differ. Some of them, while not at all affecting salvation, are interesting, and, therefore, exchange of views and an exhibition for and against said views is not an evil, but a good. On each question of this sort there will be some of our readers who do not care to look at it, and who would prefer the space otherwise filled; but no one can have a periodical filled with that which wholly suits him, for if it were so the dislike of others to his favourite aliment would starve it out of existence. Each reader must seek his portion of meat, and may find it in each number. If he cannot take dainties, or does not like them, he must not expect every one to adopt his dietary. Of course, as W. H. E. intimates, regard to proportion is the needful thing. We think that so far as the discussion of interesting topics, by articles for and against is concerned, that we have not an undue proportion. If by "contention" he points to the spirit and manner of those who thus set forth their views, we submit that there is but little to complain of—indeed we venture to claim that, in this particular, the *B. H.* may be counted somewhat of a model. Not absolutely perfect—now and then some one steps a little aside, but not often, and not widely from the mark. We shall be glad if brethren generally will keep an eye on this point, and in any case of departure send a kindly line to the erring writer, direct if they know his address, if not through the editor, who will forward the same. We shall do our best to get as near perfection as possible, and beg both writers and readers to help.

D. K.

DIKAIOSUNEE.

IN the last number of the APOSTOLIC TIMES you raise a question as to the meaning of the Greek word *dikaiosunee*, in Romans i: 17; and as you courteously refer to me, with some others, I hasten to respond as briefly as I can.

I think the word in this connection means simply God's *plan of justification* by faith; looking, however, to the act, state, and consequences of pardon as well as to the means and method of pardon. This meaning is, I think, required by the context, and also by the general scope of Paul's argument in the first eleven chapters of this epistle. In the sixteenth verse of the first chapter he says, "the gospel is the power of God for salvation to every one that believeth." This is his main *thesis* in the epistle. In the seventeenth verse he gives a reason for or in support of this, his main proposition. He says, "For in it (the gospel) God's *dikaiosunee* (scheme or method of justification) by faith, (*ek pisteos*) is revealed in order to faith, (*eis pistin*)." That is, as I understand it, in order to produce faith; as he says in the seventeenth verse of the tenth chapter, that "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."

The apostle here makes a division of his subject. In his general thesis he affirms that the gospel is the power of God for salvation to every believer: using the term salvation in its widest and most comprehensive sense, so as to include justification, sanctification, redemption and final glorification.—But from the seventeenth verse of the first chapter to the close of the fifth, the discussion is confined to the simple question of justification as above defined. In the course of his argument, the apostle shows.

I. That the doctrine of justification by faith was not a new invention on the part of God, but that it was from the beginning a part of his general plan. This is evident from the reference made to *Habakkuk*—ii: 4.

II. He show by sundry references to well known and authenticated facts, that every individual of the human race, capable of moral action, is guilty before God. And he therefore concludes that by the deeds of law or by the legal method of justification, no one of Adam's race can be justified. Romans iii: 20.

III. He then proceeds to show that in the gospel a scheme or method of justification (*dikaiosunee*) is revealed through which all men may be justified. Romans iii: 21-29. Of this scheme of justification he says:

1. That it is of God; verse 21.
 2. That it is without works of law; verse 21.
 3. That it is well sustained by evidence, being testified of by both the law and the prophets; verse 21.
 4. That it is through the faith of Jesus Christ; verse 22.
 5. That it is provided for (*eis*) all; verse 22.
 6. That it is upon (*epi*) all believers; verse 22.
 7. That it is wholly gratuitous; a matter wholly of grace and not of debt; verse 24.
 8. That it comes to us through the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ; verse 25.
 9. That it meets and fully satisfies all the claims and demands of law and justice in our behalf, and vindicates the justice of God's administration and government over man in all ages; verses 25 and 26.
 10. That it excludes all boasting; verse 27.
 11. That it justifies all believers, whether Jews or Gentiles, on the same ground; verse 28-30.
 12. That it serves to magnify God's law and make it honorable; verse 31.
- IV. In the fifth chapter, the apostle gives us a brief summary of some of the blessed fruits and consequences of being thus justified by faith. "Therefore," he says, "being justified by faith (*ek pisteos*) we have."
1. Peace with God; or, according

to some of the MSS, "let us have peace with God;" verse 1.

2. We are permitted to enjoy all the blessings and privileges of the kingdom that now is; verse 2.

3. We are enabled to glory even in our tribulations; verse 3.

4. We have a well-grounded hope that we will finally be permitted to enjoy still higher honours and privileges; verses 4-10.

5. We rejoice in all the attributes and perfections of God, to whom we have been reconciled through the atonement and intercession of Christ; verse 11.

V. In the sixth, seventh and eighth chapters the apostle takes up the second division of his subject, and proceeds to show the efficacy of the gospel as God's appointed means of sanctification, &c. But in the tenth, he again returns to the subject of justification, using the word *dikaosunee* in the same sense in which he had before used it in the seventeenth verse of the first chapter, and also in the twenty-first verse of the third chapter. He says, "For they (the Jews) being ignorant of God's *dikaosunee* (scheme or method of

justification) and going about to establish their own *dikaosunee*, (scheme of justification), have not submitted themselves to the *dikaosunee* (scheme of justification) of God." Romans x: 3.

Judging, then, from the context, and also from the general scope of the apostles argument, I am inclined to think that the word *dikaosunee*, in Romans i: 17, means, primarily, God's plan or method of justification by faith in Christ; and that it has also reference in a secondary or subordinate sense of the happy state of the justified, as well as to God's pardoning and judicial act by which, through Christ, the sinner is forgiven and treated as if he had never sinned.—Such a free and comprehensive use of terms is not at all uncommon in the writings of Paul, See, for instance, the word *katallagee*, as its meaning is developed and illustrated in Romans v: 11-21.

Hoping that these few brief suggestions may be satisfactory to you and to your readers, I remain as ever your brother in Christ, R. MILLIGAN.
KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY, March 18, '70.

INDIA, THE BIBLE, AND THE SECTS.

LONDON has just given a public welcome to Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen, the distinguished Indian religious reformer.

Dean STANLEY moved the first resolution:

"That this meeting, composed of members of nearly all Protestant Churches, offers a hearty welcome to Keshub Chunder Sen, the distinguished religious reformer of India, and assures him and his fellow labourers of its sympathy with them in their great work of abolishing idolatry, breaking down caste, and diffusing a higher moral and intellectual life among the people of that vast empire."

The Dean deemed it needful to inform the distinguished Indian, "that amidst all the divisions which he might find amongst us in England, there was still a common Christianity to which he could look with reve-

rence." In other words, the Dean seemed disposed to admit that said divisions are a disgrace, and that a disconnected Indian is in much danger of concluding that "reverence for British Christianity can scarcely be expected. But, be that as it may, it appears to us that the Indian is better prepared to instruct the Dean than is the Dean to instruct him. Take a sample of his talk—

"I did not come to England for the sake of business, or pleasure; it was not to satisfy idle curiosity, or make money that I came amongst you. A most important duty brings me here; I have a mission to fulfil. I came from India to tell you English men and women what you have done in my country. I bring to you the heartfelt thanks of 180 millions of my countrymen for the great work which you have commenced there, and which you have carried on during

the last few years. It is not the opening of railways, not the conversion of forests into smiling fields to which I allude. It is no partial reform to which I draw your attention. The great work which is going on in India under the auspices of the British Government is a work of revolutionary reform—of thorough going Radical Reform. (Cheers.) You are not lopping off the branches of corruption and evil; you have cut at the root of the tree; and you are carrying on a crusade against all the evils which India has been suffering for several ages. This is not man's work, but a work which God is doing with His own hand, using the British nation as His instruments. When India lay sunk in the mire of idolatry and superstition, when Mahomedan oppression and misrule had extinguished almost the last spark of hope in the native Indian mind, when Hindooism, once a pure system of Monotheism, had degenerated into a most horrid and abominable system of idolatry and Polytheism, when the priests were exceedingly powerful, and were reveling in their triumphs over down-trodden humanity, the Lord in His mercy sent out the British nation to rescue India. (Cheers.) In obedience to God's injunction, England came and knocked at the door of India, and said, "Noble sister, rise, thou hast slept too long." And India arose. The invitation was providential, and the response too. India rose from her lethargy of ages and saw the degraded condition to which she had been sunk, and asked England for help, and the help so much needed has been given. Certainly the earlier British rulers in Hindostan were corrupt, certainly the means often employed by the early settlers were questionable, but I look not to the human agency that was employed, but dive beneath that, and see the finger of the Allwise Providence working for the redemption of my country. I forget and forgive all that England did to injure the cause of Indian redemption in individual lives, and standing upon the universal basis of humanity see how in history God employed special agencies to elevate and exalt my country men. (Cheers.) England and India became thus connected by an overruling Providence.

The highest achievement of all, however, was the moral and religious reformation which was proceeding. When England embarked in the work she, of course, went out with the Bible in her hands. That wonderful book," he continued, "has been received and studied, and in many cases, I am happy to say, appreciated by the educated natives of India. Whatever their religious denominations may be, I am certain, and can confidently say it in this large public assembly, that if any of my countrymen ever feel a real hungering and thirsting

after spiritual comfort, they must necessarily open the pages of the Bible now and then. However proud we may be of our own religious books, however great the value may be which we attach to these priceless volumes inculcating pure Theism bequeathed in many instances by our forefathers as a precious legacy, still I cannot conceal from you the conviction, which must be admitted by all candid men, that India cannot do without the Bible. (Cheers.) There are certain things in that great book which are of much importance to my country in its present transition state. The spirit of that wonderful book comes into contact with the native Indian mind.

It is impossible for a Theist, whatever may be said to the contrary, to feel any aversion to Christ or his disciples. There are thousands, I know, who do not like to see Christ preached to the population of India. Christianity first came to India in a foreign and repulsive form. Christianity, in its founders, in its earliest tradition, in its earliest labourers, was Oriental and Asiatic, and there is no reason why it should, in the present day, be preached to the Indian population in any other form. (Cheers.) Leave us to ourselves, and let us study the Bible for ourselves. (Cheers.) Do we not find there imageries, precepts, and the manner in which those precepts were told, of a Oriental and Asiatic stamp? Do we not find that in those descriptions with which an Indian is bound to sympathise? Do we not feel that the spirit of Christianity comes to us as something very natural to the native heart—something with which, by the very constitution of our peculiarly Indian mind, we are bound to sympathise? In that spirit Christ shall be accepted by India. There may be thousands who deny that, but I for one, so long as I live, shall say that the Spirit of Christ India will one day accept. (Cheers.) But I cannot say the same thing with regard to the doctrines and dogmas which you have presented to India through your various Churches. There are so many Churches into which Christianity has been divided; there are so many different kinds of doctrine, ceremony, and ritual, prescribed and followed by different religious denominations who call themselves Christian, that India is really confounded and perplexed. (Laughter and Cheers.) When she is asked to solve the great problem, which of these is to be accepted? Which is the true one?

Each sect comes to the population and exhibits its own doctrines and dogmas. For the time being they engage the attention of the Hindoo. Perhaps, he is satisfied. But then comes the missionary of another Church and does the same, and the Hindoo's mind becomes unsettled, he thinks over the

various doctrines and dogmas; he ultimately becomes quite confounded, and knows not what to do. (Cheers.) But remember that all this time, though passing through a bewildering series of endless dogmas, he still cherishes in his heart respect and reverence for the central figure of Christ. (Cheers.) Thus it is that though the Indians have not been able to accept any particular form of Christianity, we have continued steadfast in our attachment to Jesus Christ, whom we respect and reverence.

Here we have clear views of the

providence of God, a determination to use the Bible aright, and a proper understanding that the sects are in the way of the spread of Christianity. It also appears that the people of India are repelled by such forms of professing Christianity as are taken to them from here, but are open to receive Christianity as it was at the first, and as we see it in the Bible.

Ed.

LETTER FROM MRS. CAMPBELL.

Mansion House, near Bethany,
February 24th, 1870.

Elder G. Y. Tickle.

Beloved Brother,—Let me assure you, that your name, is deeply engraved upon the tablet of my memory; and on my heart.—Your highly appreciable letter of condolence; in behalf of the Brethren of Great Britain and Ireland, addressed to me, the 12th September, after the loss of my beloved husband, Alexander Campbell, has been, and still is, a pure stream of Christian consolation. To realize the fact, from such assurances of such cherished memories and *exalted love*, being entertained, in the hearts of dear valued brethren (for one dearer to me, than words could express) could not fail to touch my afflicted sympathetic heart and cause it to *vibrate*, with the deepest feelings of gratitude—and to awaken in response thereto the purest and tenderest of emotions of Christian *esteem and love*.

I still, dear brother, retain the *freshness of sorrow* for the absence of the dear departed one. Such was the impress that Mr. Campbell made, both in the public and private walks of life, that he cannot be forgotten.—I often rejoice in my sorrow—that the labors of his life (and they are, daily widening in their influence) and the serenity of his death will descend to posterity; to happy and bless them!

The return of this season of the year, brings with it innumerable reflections, and memories of the past. It being this week, four years ago that Mr. Campbell was confined to his bed,—where he resigned his redeemed and happy spirit into the hands of Him who gave it existence.

Allow me here, dear brother, to thank you, and through you—when you meet the holy Brotherhood, at their Annual Meetings to thank them for their united sympathy and prayers, on my behalf, assuring them that through the rich mercy of our God and Father I do enjoy, according to the presentation of their prayers before the

throne of grace, that I might “experience the abiding assurance of God’s love, the abounding grace of His dear Son, and the all sustaining and comforting communion of the Holy Spirit.” Yes, thanks to our Adorable Heavenly Father, for the blessed gospel of His Son Jesus Christ—that through the knowledge of Him I hope to participate in the bliss and blessedness of heaven, and of joining with the angels and the spirits of the just made perfect in ascriptions of praise to God and the Lamb for ever and for ever.

Even now we are permitted a foretaste—

“Saints here, and those in Jesus dead,
But one communion make;
All join in Christ, their living head,
And of His grace partake.”

I have no doubt, but that it will be the privilege of redeemed spirits to be nearer the throne than even the angels, and that the latter will become listeners to the songs of *ransomed ones*.—As the Hymn sings—

“But I amid your choirs shall share,
And all your knowledge shall be mine:
You on your harps must learn to hear
A secret chord that mine shall bear.”

I am enjoying excellent health for one of my age, but am not desirous of living only so long, as I can be useful in the kingdom of my Saviour upon earth. I have read again, the past winter, Mr. Campbell’s “Letters from Europe.”—In his concluding one, I can see him, as he *waived his last adieu* to the shores of England. I have also finished the second volume of the “Memoirs” written by the *only hand*, living or dead, that could have given the faithful record, of the Life and labours of my beloved husband.

I visited the town of Wellsburg—seven miles distance from Bethany and attended, on last Lord’s day, the close of a meeting held there for some two or three weeks, by one of our Evangelists; who by the proclamation of the word of God, has brought into the fold, more than one hundred converts.—The gospel net was cast and thus the results. Of course it will take time to realize who are the pure and the

good. I felt a peculiar interest in the town spoken of, as it was *there* that my father settled (some sixty-six years ago) when coming to America; and in the beautiful Ohio river, that passes by it, I was Baptized in my 19th year. And there too, almost forty-two years, since I was married. And in that town, did Mr. Campbell plant the church, in the early part of the Reformation.

We are highly favored at Bethany with good teaching and preaching. By our beloved brother C. L. Loos, who has been constituted our presiding elder,—also by brother Pendleton and occasionally Dr. A. W. Campbell with Br. Richardson, give us lessons of instruction from the blessed Book. Besides our young College-brethren, studying for the Ministry, often speak at Wednesday evening prayer meetings and on the Lord's day evening most acceptably.

I am spending the winter happily with my son Alexander and wife near Bethany,

but expect ere long to return to reside with my youngest son, William (who at present is absent from home), at the Old Homestead.

And now, dear brother, I cannot close my communication to you—without expressing the pleasure it would afford me to welcome you and sister Tickle to the dear Old Homestead. And, indeed, I can say that any of the brethren on the other side of the great waters that would come, should find a hearty welcome by me.—And I feel assured that the brethren of B. also would heartily unite, in a welcome reception. We had a happy visit from our beloved brother and sister Coop (of Southport) in May last, that will long be remembered with pleasure.

Please give kindest Christian love to sister T. for me—and believe me, yours in the Blessed Hope of the Gospel,

S. H. CAMPBELL.

LETTER FROM AUSTRALIA.

Victoria, January 30th, 1870.

To the Editor of the *British Harbinger*.—Dr. Br.—The December number of the *B. H.* is to hand, containing a portion of a critique forwarded by me some time ago. Considering the distance from which I write, and having to deal with *three* individuals in my strictures (A. C., J. W. W., and D. K.), as also being compelled to make certain explanations to avoid misapprehension, and to shew the bearing of this question on that of two others, I could not with justice make the critique shorter and, therefore, I preferred to make it as exhaustive as possible, knowing that I should be unable to reply at this distance. But, what do I find then? Certainly not what I said nor meant to convey. The Editor has given "such portions as directly bear upon the question," but worded in such a way as to make me guilty of a piece of impertinence. Indeed, the critique (?) as it now appears may with justice be said to be without point and without any object except that of mere opposition. Now I should be very sorry that either J. W. W., or any of, your readers should imagine anything of the kind. It places me in a very false position—that of a mere dogmatic oppositionist! Had the questions of "Creeds," and "Christian Union," been added it would have been seen at once that I had some object in writing. These were the pith and marrow of the critique, and consequently ought not to have been left out. And from

the editorial remarks I should conclude that he labours under the impression that we never lift our voices against the immoral practices of our day, nor seek to convict the world of *sin*." This is a very grave mistake—one which we hope he will put out of mind. I shall not enter into any criticism of the Editor's remarks, (although I consider that he has entirely failed,) as I think it unwise to do so now, but one of two things must take place under the circumstances, viz.—Either he must insert the whole of my letter, or that it be distinctly understood that I *repudiate* the strictures attributed to me in the December number of the *British Harbinger*.

I am, &c., J. R. NORRIS.

REMARKS.

There is much difficulty in dealing with replies to articles when, by reason of distance, they come to hand five months after the appearance of the writing they reply to. This difficulty is greatly increased when they are lengthy and partly irrelevant, as in this case. We, therefore, gave only what was considered really to bear upon the question. The above note is given, as the writer deems it needful to set him right in the minds of our readers, but not one in a hundred of them will remember anything of the case, and very few, if any, will turn back to last year's issues to go again over the ground. He sent *eleven* quarto pages in reply to about two pages, which appeared nearly six months before.

ED.

QUERY.

If a brother, who has fallen more than once through intoxicating drink, confess his sin, do the Scriptures warrant the Church to require, as a condition of continued fellowship, that he promise to abstain entirely from using intoxicating drink as a beverage?

J. L.

ANSWER.

The Scriptures require repentance. The Church, of course, would not accept a mere *avowal* of repentance in the face of evi-

dence that the repentance professed is not genuine. Now a man who has more than once fallen through drink has proved that *he* cannot safely take it at all. He has more than once disgraced himself, his religion, and the Church, by trying to take it moderately, and he knows, too, that if he take none he is safe. The man who, under these circumstances, will not consent to abstain gives evidence that his repentance is in name only, and he should be held as unrepentant until he promise to put away the unnecessary thing which caused him to sin.

ITEMS OF NEWS.

CAMDEN TOWN, LONDON.—Sorry to say that from various causes we have for some time past been diminishing, and to-day at a Social Tea Meeting we have taken farewell of *seven* beloved brethren, viz: Br. and Sister Thomas and family who are leaving us to reside in Montgomeryshire, and Br. and Sister Spencer who are going to Australia. Dear Sister Thomas has been very ill for some weeks and is still so. We pray that for the sake of her beloved family and friends the change may restore her to good health, and that the dear united Christian family may be greatly blest to others in their new location and calling in life. Br. Spencer has also been ill a long while, high medical advice being to send him to Australia as the only chance for saving his life, we at once opened a subscription list to raise £50 for conveying him, his wife, and three children to Melbourne. After raising about £12 amongst the churches here, we wrote to several churches asking their aid, and more has been sent than asked for—so that they will not only be supplied with necessities but also a few comforts during their long voyage and a little in hand on arrival. At the Meeting of the church the following resolution was carried unanimously, viz: "That the thanks of the Church at Milton Hall, London, be conveyed to the Sister Churches and brethren in various parts of the country, for their kind and generous responses to our application for aid in raising funds to assist our afflicted Br. and Sister Spencer and family to Australia." It was intimated that they would have left a fortnight ago, but on further examination of ships it was decided to sail by the *Macduff* on the 1st of May.

W. LUDBROOK.

THE BIRMINGHAM DISTRICT.—During the last month a meeting of the churches of the district was held in Charles Henry Street Chapel, D. King presiding. A report from the Committee gave an outline of

labour, intimated the satisfactory condition of the district fund, and furnished other information. Applications from the church in Leicester and from a small church in Bridgenorth for admission into the district were than considered. While there was a general desire not to extend the district it was considered that these two churches must be looked upon as exceptional. Leicester, on account of having been brought into public life by D. King, and now earnestly entreating for help from him; and Bridgenorth, on account of having originated with members removed from Birmingham. It was resolved unanimously that Leicester and Bridgenorth be added to the district.

LEICESTER.—The church here has been refreshed by a visit from Br. D. King, after an absence of between two and three years. He delivered a course of addresses to the public, and spent many hours in converse with enquirers. On the Lord's day evening, one was immersed by Br. T. Leavesley, and on the Wednesday evening one, who during the week, had been so instructed as to be able to throw off his Calvinism made application to unite with the church. Several earnest enquirers seem not far from the kingdom. Br. K. is expected to return in a few weeks in order to promote the election of deacons and otherwise advance the order of the church.

BLACKBURN.—The church here has again had occasion to rejoice at the conversion of three persons, who have been baptized into the name of Jesus. We much regret the removal of Br. William Hindle, who has laboured with earnestness and zeal we would all do well to imitate. He has gone away with the esteem and love of all the brethren. We pray that in his new sphere of work his labours may be crowned with success. We have received a valuable acquisition in the person of Br. Broadfoot. We are looking forward with much pleasure to the time when Br. King shall favour us

with his long-promised visit, and so aid us to set in order the things that are wanting.

W. C. TURNER.

BRIGHTON.—Since our last report we have added nine to our numbers—seven by immersion, one from the Baptists, and one restored. We are living in peace and unity, and are looking for more to obey the Saviour. We have lately lost several members by removal, so that our numbers do not increase very much.

B. ELLIS.

LINCOLN.—We record with pleasure the immersion this morning of William Howell, who we hope will be an assistance to us in the good work.—April 10, 1870.—J. T. B.

AUSTRALIA.—The following are from the *Pioneer* for February:—ADELAIDE: T. J. G. reports that *four* have obeyed the Saviour; also, a tea meeting to bid farewell to H. S. Earl and A. T. Magarey, who have left for a visit to America. MILANG: S. Judd reports *seven* immersed during the month—one to take membership in Milang,

and six at Langhorne Bridge where a church of twenty members has been formed. STRATHALBYN: C. Wade records *three* added to the church by baptism, also the formation of a Sunday School. WILLUNGA: S. Kidner names *three* as added by faith and baptism. BRIGHTON: S. Coles reports the enlargement and re-opening of the church edifice, and special services by Brn. Surber, Carr, and Green.

Obituary.

Fell asleep in Jesus, March 2, 1870, RICHARD PHILLPOT. He was immersed into Christ in 1868, maintained a consistent Christian character, and after a most painful illness, borne with Christian fortitude and patience, death put an end to his sufferings. We sorrow not as those who have no hope.

B. ELLIS.

ELIZABETH SHAW departed this life at Stourbridge, April 10, 1870, aged *seventeen* years. "Not lost, but gone before."

The Family Room.

MOTHER DO YOU SAY YOUR PRAYERS?

These words were uttered by little Anna, as she looked up inquiringly in her Mother's face. "Do you say your prayers, Mother? again repeated Anna. Mother appeared rather confused and hung down her head without answering.

Ah, how the words entered into that Mother's soul! She felt their cutting power as they came so artlessly from the lips of her own child who knelt before her to say the evening prayer. It was with a blushing and averted face that she made the humiliating confession, "Mother is a very naughty woman and for a long time has not prayed to God at all."

Anna said nothing, but rose from her knees with some strange thoughts in her little brain about how it could be a good thing for children to pray that Jesus would make them "gentle, meek, and mild," but not for grown up people like Father and Mother. Surely the blessing of "Our Father who art in heaven" was needed by all His children, young and old, to make them more

like Jesus? Why then should they not ask Him to do so?

Her parents had once known the Lord and rejoiced in Him as obedient believers, but for some time had departed from the "good old ways" and become backsliders from the truth. It is true that no one could point to them as really immoral characters, for they were neither drunkards nor swearers, and besides, they lived at peace with themselves and their neighbours. The special features in their departure from the faith were those of a simple indifference to religion and a grasping after the things of this present life. These sins in their case, as alas! they have done in too many others, bade fair to eat out from their hearts every remnant of true Godliness. Having once known God they were now living without Him, and without hope in the world, treading under foot the blood of Christ with which they had been sanctified. In this state of apostasy Anna's Mother had many bitter reflections knowing well that they were under God's displeasure,

and could expect nothing here or hereafter but fearful judgment.

Still the cares of the world and the workings of the deceitful heart kept her from returning to Christ and the fellowship of His people. But now, mark the hand of divine love working silently, but surely, through little Anna's words, to call back her parents from their backsliding. Mother could not from this time forward keep that childish enquiry from ringing in her ears. It haunted her everywhere. In the kitchen or in the market place the "still small voice" was heard saying "Mother," and again, "Mother, do you say your prayers?" Oh how the former seasons of deep spiritual delight enjoyed with God in prayer came back to memory as if to mock the true poverty and wretchedness of their present home life.

Now from the altar of their hearts,
No nightly Ebenezer rose in gratitude
To God above, the giver of all good,
For benefits received.

And such a lesson to the rising family; precept without example! "Don't do as I do but do as I bid you!" She felt condemned before her Maker and resolved by His help to repent and turn to her first love. It was a gradual work. First, Anna was surprised one morning at not receiving an answer as she stood at the foot of the stairs calling with childish curiosity, "Mother, what are

you doing up stairs so long? Do tell me? All was silence; no reply. For several mornings the same thing occurred, Anna being left alone in the kitchen, while her Mother after getting breakfast ready for Father, went up stairs for a short time. One morning after coming down, Anna was lifted upon her Mother's knee and told in a weak and faltering voice, and with tearful eye, "You must not, dear, call after Mother in that way when she has gone up stairs, for *Mother is then saying her prayers*. Now do remember like a good girl." . . . And so the good work went on, both parents having serious and earnest talk together upon the necessity of changing their lives and drawing nearer to God. Their good resolutions by the divine help were soon put into practice, and now Anna is quite happy when her turn comes to go to chapel on Lord's day morning with Father or Mother, to see the disciples of Jesus met there to remember Him in the Feast of Love.

Truly they are a happy family, poor it may be, but rich in faith, thankful to God that among other means these words were spoken which awakened their slumbering hearts to the better and nobler life in Christ,—"*MOTHER, DO YOU SAY YOUR PRAYERS.*" The above, as near as may be, occurred in Birmingham.

J. A.

THE YOUNG MARTYRS.

THE inquisition of the Low Countries, thirsting for blood, scoured the neighboring country, searching everywhere for the young Augustines, who had escaped from the Antwerp persecution. Esch, Voes, and Lambert were at last discovered, put in chains, and conducted to Brussels. Egmondanus, Hochstraten, and several other inquisitors summoned them to their presence. "Do you retract your opinion," inquired Hochstraten, "that the priest has no power to forgive sins, but that the power belongs to God alone?"—and then he went on to enumerate other gospel truths which he required them to abjure. "No, We will retract nothing!" exclaimed Esch and

Voes, firmly: "we will not disown God's word, we will rather die for the faith!"

The Inquisitor. "Confess that you have been deceived by Luther."

The Young Augustines. "As the apostles were deceived by Jesus Christ."

The Inquisitors. We declare you to be heretics, worthy of being burnt alive; and deliver you over to the secular arm."

Lambert was silent. The prospect of death terrified him; distress and uncertainty agitated his heart. "I request four days' respite," said he, in stifled emotion. He was taken back to prison. As soon as this respite was expired, Esch and Voes were degraded from their priestly office, and

handed over to the council of the reigning governess of the Low Countries. The council delivered them bound to the executioner. Hochstraten and three other inquisitors accompanied them to the place of execution.

Arriving at the scaffold, the young martyrs contemplated it with calmness. Their constancy, their piety, and their youth, drew tears from the inquisitors themselves. When they were bound to the stake, the confessors drew near. "Once more we ask if you will receive the Christian faith."

The Martyrs. We believe in the Christian Church, but not in your Church."

Half an hour elapsed. It was a pause of hesitation. A hope had been cherished that the near prospect of such a death would intimidate these youths. But, alone tranquil of all the crowd that thronged the square, they began to sing psalms,—stopping from time to time to declare that they were resolved to die for the name of Jesus Christ.

"Be converted, be converted," cried the inquisitors, "or you will die in the name of the devil." "No," answered the martyrs; "we will die like Christians, and for the truth of the Gospel." The pile was then lighted. Whilst the flame slowly ascended, a heavenly peace dilated their hearts; and one of them could even say, "I seem to be on a bed of roses." The solemn hour was come—death was at hand. The two martyrs cried with a loud voice, "O Lord Jesus, Son of David, have mercy upon us!" and then they began to recite their creed. At last the flames reached them; but the fire consumed the cords which fastened them to the stake before their breath was gone. One of them, feeling his liberty, dropped upon his knees in the midst of the flames, and then, in worship to his Lord, exclaimed, clasping his hands, "Lord Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on us."

Their bodies were quickly wrapped in flame; they shouted, "*Te Deum laudamus.*" Soon their voices were stifled,—and their ashes alone remained.

This execution lasted four hours. It was on the 1st of July, 1523, that the first martyrs of the Reformation laid down their lives for the Gospel.

All good men shuddered when they heard of these events. The future was big with

anticipations. "The executions have begun," said Erasmus. "At length," exclaimed Luther, "Christ is gathering some fruits of our preaching, and preparing new martyrs."

But the joy of Luther in the constancy of these young Christians was disturbed by Lambert. Of the three, Lambert possessed most learning; he had been chosen to fill the place of Probst, as preachers at Antwerp. Finding no peace in his dungeon, he was terrified at the prospect of death; but still more by conscience, which reproached him with his cowardice, and urged him to confess the Gospel. Delivered ere long, from his fears, he boldly proclaimed the truth, and died like his brethren.

A noble harvest sprung up from the blood of these martyrs. Brussels manifested a willingness to receive the Gospel. "Wherever Alexander lights a pile," remarked Erasmus, "there it seems as if he had sown heretics."

"I am bound with you in your bonds," exclaimed Luther, "your dungeons and your burnings my soul takes part in. All of us are with you in spirit; and the Lord is above it all!"

He proceeded to compose a hymn commemorative of the death of the young monks; and soon, in every direction, throughout Germany and the Low Countries, in towns and in villages, was heard accents of song which communicated an enthusiasm for the faith of the martyrs.

Flung to the heedless winds,
Or on the waters cast,
Their ashes shall be watched,
And gathered at the last.
And from that scattered dust,
Around us and abroad,
Shall bring a plenteous seed
Of witnesses for God.

Jesus hath now received
Their latest living breath,—
Yet vain is Satan's boast
Of victory in their death.
Still, still, though dead, they speak,
And trumpet-tongued proclaim
To many a wakening land,
The one availing Name.

D'Aubigne.

"HOLD THOU ME UP."

I am weary, O my God!
Give me rest in Thee;
May the comfort of Thy word
Still my solace be.

Man is false, and I am sad—
Nigh despondency;
Yet in Thee will I be glad,
As Thy face I see.

I am frail, and subtle snares
There are laid for me;

Guide my feet, less unawares,
I am drawn from Thee.

I am wayward, O my God!
Curb this fault in me;
Chasten when I need the rod,
Lest I fall from Thee.

When life's ocean-tempests rage—
Dangers threaten me;
Bid the 'whelming floods assuage,
Lord deliver me!

J. C.

Christianity and Infidelity.

THE HOLYOAKE AND BRADLAUGH DEBATE.

G. J. HOLYOAKE is the founder of Secularism. C. Bradlaugh is President of the "National Secular Society." The "*National Reformer*," which it would be more proper to designate a *National Deformer*, was conducted by Holyoake and Bradlaugh conjointly, but Mr. Holyoake withdrew on account of its tendency to contaminate and demoralize. Since then the Founder and the President have not manifested any great love for each other. As a matter of policy they, as much as possible, avoid coming into conflict. The debate here referred to took place in March last. Mr. Holyoake affirmed that "The Principles of Secularism do not include Atheism," and that "Secular Criticism does not involve Scepticism," and in this he is right and Mr. B. is wrong. But just because Mr. H. thus adheres to the right he cannot create an organization of any magnitude; while, on the other hand, Mr. Bradlaugh is elected president of the *National Society*" (a large name for so small a thing) which being negative and destructive and having really nothing to build upon will not pay its own lecturers. It keeps three or four persons, whom it delights to honour, almost unoccupied, excepting to the extent that the pay can be extracted from the pockets of opponents.

But into these matters we desire not further to enter. Our purpose being that of reproducing a few passages from the debate.

I. SINLESS SINCERITY is a curious phrase for Mr. Holyoake to use! But not a bad one of itself. He puts it thus—

"Mr. Bradlaugh's memory served him quite well, when he said that I had added, in my recent statement, the word 'well-informed' to 'sincerity.' Mr. Bradlaugh asks whether I am to judge if he is well-

informed. I agree with him, that would be reprehensible, but I did not imply that. I merely said this. If a man is to justify his sincerity to his conscience, if his sincerity is to be without sin, then he must make up his mind; he must know all about the subject that he can know, when he professes to be sinless upon it. I use the term to put an end to that commonplace sincerity, which so many people have, which is ignorant sincerity, which is crude and blind, notwithstanding it is sincere—because it is ignorant. A man has no right to say, 'My sincerity shall be respected,' until he has taken care not to have an ignorant, and narrow, and prejudiced sincerity; he is bound to have as enlarged a sincerity as he possibly can compass. Now, I want to know why it is when a man's attention is directed to those principles of morality which are found in the process of nature, and he shall study this vast world of physical science, which shall make him master of his destiny, giving him that information which shall guide him and guard him from error—he should as a Secularist be disqualified from looking beyond this life, or from having any speculation about it? Why should he not conjecture whether God is at the bottom of this mystery of existence, whether there is not a future world? A man must ask himself something about the unknown world or life into which he may be going. Suppose we regard death as I regard it, as some last venture on an untried existence; you cannot prevent a man asking the question—If I am a moralist, and if I do good to the utmost of my power, will not that be my justification?"

We accept this discriminating putting of the case—there is a sincerity which is not *sinless*, being "*ignorant*," "*narrow*," and "*prejudiced*" It is not then true, as Secularists affirm, that belief is involuntary and that every man believes just what he *must* believe. Sincerity, according to Mr. Holyoake, may be either sinful or sinless, either justifiable or not. We thank him for the admission and shall not forget to use it.

II. THE DREARINESS of Secularism comes out, too, in the foregoing quotation. Mr. H. regards death as a "last venture on an un-

tried existence." Dark indeed must be the deathbed of such an one! But in thus putting it he displays honesty and courage. He walks up to the outer wall of his domain, looks over, but finds nothing but darkness. He says, "soon I must go over there: 'tis a venture—there may be another life; I know nothing about it." But what says Bradlaugh?

"I do not think that the teacher whose views are in such a state of uncertainty on that subject, while he might be a Secular scholar, ought to be a Secular teacher. I think the Secularist is one who has learnt enough of the 'how' of his existence, to know that instead of death being a last venture on an untried existence, it is an entire cessation of his individual existence altogether. This is the broad ground I will take."

Holyoake, then, is not fit to be a Secular teacher. Bradlaugh is the teacher. He knows the unknowable, and, with characteristic foolhardiness, rushes in where prudent men dare not tread. He knows that "death is *not* a last venture," that it is "an entire cessation of individual existence altogether." He says, "This is the broad ground I WILL take." But he knows that he knows nothing about what there is after death, and his seeming boldness is but as the whistling of the plough-boy who in passing the church at night is in terrible fear of ghosts. It is the assumed boldness of a very coward. Mr. Holyoake walks up to the consequent of his own position, and with dignity proclaims it. He intends to live his life and then take his last venture. But the other man shuts his eyes and shrieks out his denial of what he knows to be before him. But his opponent's reply was equal to the occasion—

"I always use the language in which Mr. Thomas Cooper puts it in the prelude to his famous poem, 'I do not say there is no God, but this I say—I know not.' Mr. Bradlaugh goes further. He says, 'I do not deny God, because the word conveys to me no idea, and I cannot deny that which presents to me no distinct affirmation. I cannot war with a nonentity. If, however, God is affirmed to represent an existence which is distinct from the existence of which

I am a mode, and which it is alleged is not that existence, then I deny God, and affirm that it is impossible any such existence can be.' All I can say is, I congratulate Mr. Bradlaugh on possessing that infinite knowledge which is so unwise a display when the Theist claims it. I think the Theist assumes an infinite knowledge when he says he knows there is a God. I think he who says that one is impossible, betrays an equal capacity for knowing everything."

BRADLAUGH'S VANITY. — Mr. H. had to rebuke. He has the habit of hitching himself on to certain useful and nearly won movement, and then shouting victory to the praise and glory of himself and Secularism. He, too, supposes that priests have a special dread of him, whereas there are men that they much more fear. Mr. Holyoake says—

"Mr. Bradlaugh thinks that all priests have great fear of him. It is very pardonable that he should not be wanting in a good opinion of himself, that he should imagine that peculiar result of his efforts. I see a good deal of priests. I know the encouragement they take from many of the speeches he delivers. He serves to make their fortune, and to make their flocks gather round them more closely than ever. I know that it cannot but beset. Priests would be more than human if they could, without pride, hear his almost frantic proclamations of the strength of their efforts: aggrandising their powers: proclaiming their might: declaring until the Bible is displaced no progress can be made: and always devoting all his energies to their destruction. They cannot fail to feel flattered that they are admitted to be so powerful a body. All that not only makes no glad impression on my mind, it makes rather a mournful one, not because I have a remitting spirit: not because I have not as proud a determination to oppose that which is superstitious as Mr. Bradlaugh, but because I am too proud to condescend to pay priests the homage of my particular and absorbed attention: because I know they can be checked more securely, more completely, more lastingly, and more severely for themselves, by that determination which is strong enough to attend to its own business, make its own statements to the public, and put the people under the dominion of independent ideas. Mr. Bradlaugh talks about leadership: there is no leadership in this world now possible, except the leadership of ideas. Those who have the truest opinions will rule the minds of men effectually, in spite of all clamour. He forgets, when he talks of the state of the law of oaths—and that

amendment of it which we are just now possibly achieving—of the advocacy which preceded it. Although at the eleventh hour Mr. Bradlaugh has come into the field and worked with effect, yet there were long years when I was trying to prove that view of the law now happily arrived at."

THE ROUGHS OF DEBATE.—Bradlaugh on the one side and Brewin Grant on the other are very fairly pointed out by Mr. Holyoake, as outraging those whom they oppose.

"Mr. Bradlaugh thinks the policy of going and attacking every person whom he finds or thinks worthy of exposure, to be wholesome. He put the case last night of a man who is a forger. Is he not, he asks, to denounce a forger? If you confound different things together, penal with controversial policy, no argument can be held; but in public and general controversy I say it is a desirable thing that persons who are opponents should be encouraged to express their opinion, and feel confident that they will be heard with fairness and courtesy, and replied to without humiliating them. I remember in Halifax, when the Rev. Enoch Mellor first came forward, he said he would oppose every one who came into the town to criticise the defects of Christianity, and we had prospects evermore of a respectable and influential opponent. But Mr. Robert Cooper was sent for, who humiliated him in the presence of his flock. The flock went home and the minister too with a fair excuse for retracting his promise, and down to this day they never would suffer him to appear any more, and we have not since been able to obtain a respectable and efficient opponent there, but instead of having, as we used to have, a variety of worthy opponents, we have been condemned to deal with second-rate persons, and no minister of distinction has come into the field to hold controversy. When I see an opponent rise up I regard him as a God-sent individual—the most valuable instrument vouchsafed to men—for bringing out the truth of a discourse, or criticising it. Every opponent is an advantage. He affords the only reliable means of comparing opinion with opinion, and making reflections and completed observations for the use of those who are present. I have proposed we should never humiliate adversaries, that we should never treat them in the worst way it is possible to treat them. It is a pleasant thing to be abusive, every man has a good deal of the savage in him. It is no doubt to some a desirable thing to be disagreeable. It is easier to be disagreeable than the other thing. When you throw open controversy to invective, it gives you the greatest grati-

fication, because it is the most powerful method of attracting popular attention. It is very amusing, very exciting, very exhilarating—but it is not progress. Let us not forget our own experience. With what hatred did not the Rev. Brewin Grant inspire the Secular party? I said I would decline to act on the side of any cause that produced an advocate of that order; and how many Christians have gone away from us because they, in some of our Halls, have been subjected to similar treatment, and have felt in a similar manner."

NON-SUCCESS OF BRADLAUGH AND PARTY.—The wind is taken out of Mr. Bradlaugh's bags and his boasting is exposed by the following:—

"Mr. Bradlaugh wanders through this land proclaiming the principles of Secularism as though they were Atheism, and arguing with the clergy. Why, when I go now to Glasgow, to Huddersfield, to Manchester, I find the Secularists there unadvanced in position. Even in Northampton, which Mr. Bradlaugh knows, I found them lately meeting on the second floor of a public-house, where I found them twenty or twenty-five years ago. In Glasgow they are in the same second-rate position they were in twenty-five or thirty years ago. What have we been doing? Does this not show an obsolete policy? Ranters, Muggletonians, Mormons, and men of their stamp, are superior to acting so. Any party in the present state of opinion in the world could with thought have done more. The most ordinary sects build or hire temples and other places, where their people decently meet. Mr. Bradlaugh, with all his zeal and appeals, finds to-day that all London can do is to put up this kind of place in which we now meet opposite a lunatic asylum, where people, so the enemy says, naturally expect to find us. (Great laughter.) He is even obliged to tell you that at the West-end of London he does not think highly of their state. Now, we who have principles of Materialism, and decant most incessantly on their superiority and efficacy, what halls of splendour and completeness we ought to put up."

Mr. Holyoake is right—the boasted success is but *failure*. A few people in most of the large towns are seduced into helping Bradlaugh and Watts to eke out their living, and that they do by getting at the pockets of those whom they oppose. We might fear to write thus, lest we might stimulate them to liberality, and thus promote giving to a bad

cause. But we need not fear on that head. There is no power in their principles to touch their hearts, and when the heart is untouched the

pockets are closed. They know they have nothing worth paying for.
D. K.

BRADLAUGH ON D. KING.

It may be desirable shortly to favour Mr. Bradlaugh with a letter, which may be freely distributed over the country wherever he lectures. At this writing we can only notice one item, which is a fair sample of the utter disregard to truth which generally characterizes his dealing with whatever relates to the Editor of the *B. H.* In his *Reformer*, April 17, he says—

"The *British Harbinger* has its usual page of coarse abuse against Secularists, to which it adds and reprints, without mentioning the *Rock*, one of the recent leading articles from that journal. Certainly the style is an improvement on Mr. King's; but why did he put 'Ed.' at the bottom? Was this intended to figure as if Mr. King had written it?"

The allusion is to the *B. H.* of last month. The reader will perceive that Bradlaugh will write any falsehood, or any number of falsehoods, that may serve his purpose. He implies that in our last issue there was our usual page of coarse abuse. Now we have not usually devoted a page to Secularists. They have had but occasional notice, and then we have been careful to write only the truth. If they publish lies and circulate demoralizing and filthy literature and we make known what they are doing, then we are charged with coarse abuse. Then it is said, that to said usual page we add and reprint an article from the *Rock*. Now we have never read a line in the *Rock* concerning Mr. Bradlaugh. The reprint referred to is part of a leading article in the *Bury Express*. Then it is suggested that being a better production than D. K. could write it was inserted without acknow-

ledging that it was not his own, and "Ed." put at the bottom to "figure as if Mr. King had written it." But, suppose we were to insist that the man who so intimates can be nothing short of a knave and a willful slanderer, would that be "coarse abuse?" Perhaps Mr. Bradlaugh would say so and, therefore, we will not so designate him, but leave the facts to speak for themselves. Turning to page 141 of the *B. H.* there will be found an article headed "The Decadence of Christianity," and that article is, with the exception of eleven lines reprinted from the *Bury Express*. So far is it from being an unacknowledged quotation that it is not only marked at the beginning and the end by the usual quotation marks, but it is introduced by these words—"Bradlaugh has held some large meetings in London and his *Reformer* is jubilant. Hence a recent issue congratulates its friends in an article headed *The Decadence of Christianity*. We were smiling over the production when a contemporary, not known to our readers generally, took said article in hand supplied and pretty much that was in our own mind. He says." This is followed by the article, beginning and ending with quotation marks. It is thus then, carefully given as a reprint from a contemporary and in every possible way properly marked as such. But, perhaps, there is not much room to complain as this kind of thing belongs to the special providence of the Secularism of the "Unbounded License Party" of which Mr. Bradlaugh is chief.
Ed.

THE DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE AS TO THE RELATION OF BAPTISM AND THE REMISSION OF SINS.

THAT Christian baptism stands in some relation to the remission of sins is undisputed. To deny this were to deny the express declarations of Holy Writ. So long as it is said, "John came preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," (Mark i, 4;) "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," (Mark xvi, 16;) "Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins," (Acts ii. 38,) etc., no one can deny that whatever particular theologies may teach, the Scriptures do undeniably declare that some relation has been divinely established between baptism and the remission of sins. We shall, in this article, take this as conceded.

Again, we shall assume that Christian baptism is a positive institution, deriving its authority solely from the command of Christ, and that the remission of sins is a free and sovereign act of divine grace, bestowed according to God's own good pleasure, and, of course, through channels and upon conditions of his own choice and prescription. If baptism is to be respected at all, it is simply and only because the Saviour has ordained it; and if remission of sins is to be received at all, it is simply and only because it pleaseth the Father to grant it; and if there be any definite and determinate way in which it is granted, or formal conditions preliminary to conferring it, it is simply and solely because the Great Head of the Church has so prescribed and established it. The reason for selecting and ordaining baptism is *God's* reason, not *man's*; and the connection between it and the remission of sins is of *His* appointment, not *man's*. We, therefore, cannot change or modify the one or the other. We are not at liberty to search out *fanciful* reasons for baptism, and make these the basis of our treatment of this positive institution of the Christian economy; neither can we philosophize about the connection between baptism and the remission of sins so as to make void the plain and explicit declarations of the Word of God about it.

The relation between the two being conceded, and the obligation to accept this relation, as it is stated in the declarations of the Inspired Word about it, being also granted, we are left to the simple inquiry: What is the relation which the Saviour has established between baptism and the remission of sins as declared by his own Word?

This question can be rightly answered only by determining accurately the meaning of those passages of Scripture in which this relation is affirmed to exist. The meaning of these passages must be ascertained before we can understand the doctrine of Scripture on this subject. Happily they are few, and the importance of the subject will justify us in a careful examination of them all. And since the question is one of *relation*, and this is expressed by a *preposition*, our inquiry will be still further narrowed in its scope; it will be confined primarily to the determination of the meaning of a *preposition*, the little Greek word *eis*. That the question in its most elementary form is only this, will be evident on the simple inspection of the passages to be examined: "The baptism of repentance *unto* (*eis*) the remission of sins." "Repent and be baptized . . . *for* (*eis*) the remission of sins." In both these passages the relation between baptism and the remission of sins is expressed in the Greek by the same preposition, (*eis*), and when we have determined what this little word means, we have determined what this relation is. Let this, then, be our first inquiry.

Our best Greek critics say that "the proper meaning of *eis* (*eis*) is

'within,' 'in,' with the idea of the being within a space having boundaries. It is opposed to *ek*, (ἐκ.) *ex*, (ἐξ,) 'out,' 'without.' This is its *proper* meaning, but when it is used with its case, (the accusative,) or to qualify verbs of action, this meaning is variously modified, so that other seemingly derivative meanings are properly assigned to it. We find these various meanings of *eis* nowhere more fully and accurately given than in the following table from the thorough and exhaustive work of Dr. Harrison on "Greek Prepositions and Cases of Nouns," p. 226:

Signification of <i>eis</i> .	Accusat. a. "Up to," "As far as."	b. "As to," "as regards."
"In," "within."	a. "Up to," "as far as." b. "Until," "against," (of time, etc.) c. "By—," (distribution.)	a. "Into," "to," (within.) b. "To," (pregnant construction.) c. "Among." d. "Against," (hostility.) e. "As regards," "in the case of," "touching," "on." f. "For," (object, purpose.) g. "To," "so as to," (result.)

This table is exhaustive. We presume no scholar will deny this. It is strictly *critical*, and free from the vagueness often introduced into popular lexicons. It shows that the *proper* meaning of *eis* is "in," "within." That the *accusative case*, with which alone it is used, primarily marks the object reached by an action or motion, answering to the English phrases "up to," "as far as;" and that, secondarily, it (the accusative) denotes (a) the measure and extent of an action or motion, and (b) the limits within which any expression is to be understood as confined, answering to the English phrases "as to," "as regards," (*Har.*, p. 140,) and that the two, (the preposition *eis* and the *accusative case*,) in connection, give the seemingly derivative meanings of, "for," "against," "until," "up to," "as regards," etc., as detailed in the subordinate divisions of the table.

Now with these simple and undeniable principles of criticism any man of common sense, even though he know nothing about Greek, can easily determine for himself what must be the sense of *eis*, as used in the passages before us, to express the relation between *baptism* and the *remission of sins*. Let us take the first clause of Peter's response to the inquiring Pentecostians, "Repent and be baptized," and apply to it these several meanings of *eis*, and see which alone will give any intelligible sense to the command: *Repent and be baptized* "up to," "as far as," *the remission of sins*: *Repent and be baptized* "until," "against," (of time, etc.) *the remission of sins*: *Repent and be baptized* "by—" (distribution*) *the remission of sins*: *Repent and be baptized* "into," "to," (within,) *the remission of sins*: *Repent and be baptized* "to," (pregnant construction†) *the remission of sins*: *Repent and be baptized* "among," *the remission of sins*? *Repent and be baptized* "against," (hostility) *the remission of sins*: *Repent and be baptized* "as regards,"

* Equivalent to the English expression "by files," "by fifties," and such like.

† By this is meant cases in which the verb of action, used with *eis* besides its *proper* meaning, involves also another consequent action; as, for example, when Xenophon says, "This city the inhabitants abandoned into a strong fortress upon the mountains," the word *abandoned* has a pregnant sense, involving, beside the idea of "forsaking" the town, that also of "fleeing" to the mountains, so that it is equivalent to saying, "This city the inhabitants abandoned [and fled] into the mountains." (See *Har.*, p. 211.)

"in the case of," "touching," "on," * *the remission of sins: Repent and be baptized* "for" (object or purpose) *the remission of sins: Repent and be baptized* "to," "so as to" (result) *the remission of sins*. These are all the possible meanings of Peter's command, so far as the relation between baptism and the remission of sins concerned, and what can any man make of it but that the *terminus ad quem*, the end of the baptism, the object in view, the purpose for which it was received, the thing with regard to which it was required, was the remission of sins.

While *eis* may be translated by so many different words and phrases, it never loses its proper meaning of "in," "within." This is its force everywhere, namely, "that the subject (that is, the true logical subject) between which and something else this preposition is used to express a relation, comes or is brought to be "in," "within," that something else. Dr. Harrison says: "When *eis* is added to the action or motion of the verb, or to any substantive idea that may imply these, and regard is had to the accusative case following, there arises from the conjunction of the preposition, with its sense of 'in,' 'within,' of the action or motion of the verb with its now defined direction, and of the accusative case, with its power of marking the limits within which the action or motion is confined the sense of 'into,' and the effect is to represent the subject of the action or motion as brought within the circumscribed space, class, or category, state, or circumstances named by the noun in the accusative"—p. 221. This statement describes precisely the circumstances which are found in the passages which we have under discussion. Let us apply it to them. We begin with Mark's statement about John, that "he came preaching the baptism of repentance *eis* the remission of sins." Here the phrase, "baptism of repentance," is described by *eis* as having a relative direction of "in," "within," a *terminus ad quem*; the accusative case—"remission of sins"—denotes the object with regard to which it has this relative direction, and the effect is to represent the person who is the subject of the baptism as brought "into," or within the state or circumstances described by "remission of sins."

The passage in Acts ii. 38, requires the same explanation. The command of Peter, "Repent and be baptized," is made by *eis* to point in a certain direction; not "around," "above," or "beneath," but "in," "within," and the circumscribed limits of this direction are defined by the accusative to be *the remission of sins*. The baptism looks to this, and nothing else, and the effect is to represent the subject of baptism as brought into or within the condition described by the logical accusative—"the remission of sins."

It is not necessary to say that the preposition *eis* properly, and of itself, expresses *purpose* or *design*; it is not, in fact, strictly true to say so; but where the action is that of a rational agent, or is the command of an intelligent authority, purpose or design is implied in this, and then the preposition expresses the direction of the purpose or design, the end to which the rational action looks, and this end is definitely determined and limited by the following accusative. Nothing in language can be more perspicuous and sharply defined than the relation expressed by *eis* with its case, yet it is often perverted into strange uses, and treated as if it could express relations the most opposite conceivable.

To avoid this obvious force of the preposition *eis*, and to sustain a theory

* The cases in which *eis* means *on* are such as, "Who is going to expend his own substance 'on' you," etc., equal to "with regard to you" as the object of the spending, so that if we adopt this meaning in our passage, it will mean "Repent and be baptized with regard to the remission of sins," having that in view as the object of baptism.

which would make baptism not an antecedent, but a consequent of the remission of sins, other passages of Scripture have been appealed to in order to show it must, at least in them, mean something quite different. It is necessary, therefore, in order to defend our criticism against superficial objection, to notice some of the strongest cases that have been, or can be, appealed to. It is said in Matt. iii, 11, "I indeed baptize you with water *unto* (*eis*) repentance." Here it is claimed that *eis* can not point to purpose or design, for John did not baptize to make penitents, but baptized such as were penitents. But this reverses the first canon of interpretation, and instead of ascertaining the meaning of the *passage by the words*, interprets the words by an assumed meaning put upon the *passage*. It says the passage means *so* and *so*, and then forces the preposition *eis* out of its plain and uniformly-established meaning, to make it agree with a pre-established interpretation of the passage. But what is the true analysis of this Scripture? Is it not this? Baptize is a verb of action. It is followed by the preposition *eis*, with the accusative case. The established *proper* meaning of this preposition in such a connection is to indicate the *terminus ad quem*, that with a "view to which" the thing is done or commanded. This is, in such a case, its plain and acknowledged signification by the consent of all lexicographers and grammarians whose authority is worth quoting. It has been established by an exhaustive induction, and there can be found no respectable dissent. What, then, is the special *terminus ad quem*, or *end*, to which baptism here looks? Evidently "repentance" (*μετανοίαν*). The conclusion is inevitable. The passage means, "I indeed baptize you *unto*," or, "with a view" to repentance; that is, the persons baptized are brought into a state engaging a life of repentance. To say that John baptized those who came to him *because* they had repented, is to confound the preposition *eis* with *dia*. If the Evangelist had wished to say that their repentance was the "ground," or "reason," of his baptizing them, he would have used *dia metanoian* (*διὰ μετανοίαν*), on account of repentance, and not, as he does, *eis metanoian* (*εἰς μετανοίαν*), *with a view to repentance*. He could have said *dia*, to mark the "ground" or "reason" of his action, as easily as he did say *eis*, to mark the "end" or "object" of his action.

It may be true, and from the manner in which he reproved the Pharisees and Sadducees, who came to his baptism, it is probable that John did, in some suspicious cases, require some *evidence* of penitence previous to baptism; but, as a general rule, he could have known nothing more than that the parties were willing to be baptized as a solemn engagement to a life of penitence in preparation for the kingdom which he taught them was at hand. The great multitudes whom he immersed made it impossible for him to require any special *proofs* of sincere repentance in every case. If his baptism had been (*dia*) because of repentance already experienced, then he should have required a special experience in every case before baptizing any one. On the contrary, when all Jerusalem and Judea went out to his baptism, he required only a confession of their sins, and this, most likely, only implicitly, or as it was involved in their demand for baptism.

But of all this, the passage before us affirms nothing. It tells us that John baptized them *eis* "with a view to" repentance—and this is intelligible. It is the correct rendering of the words, and there is an evident meaning in them which is consistent also with the general scope and significance of other Scriptures, especially with the varied form of expression which is found in Mark i. 4, Luke iii. 3, and Acts xix. 4. Mark,

Luke, and Paul all use this expression, "Baptism of repentance," in the same sense. Perhaps we cannot better express the final conclusion of the highest criticism on these passages than by quoting the precise and accurate words of Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander, Professor of Theology to the Congregational Churches of Scotland, and Examiner in Philosophy to the University of St. Andrews; also editor of the last edition of Kitto's "Cyclopedia of Religious Literature." He says: "instead of a preposition the genitive of object is sometimes used, as 'the baptism of repentance' (*Βαπτισμα μετανοίας*), (Luke iii. 3, *et al.*), as equal to baptism *into* or *for* repentance; that is, the baptism which has repentance (*μετανοία*) as its end and purpose." (*Kitto, Art. Baptism*).

Another passage of Scripture appealed to in proof that *eis* is sometimes used to express "the ground," "reason," or occasion of an action is Matt. xii. 41, where Jesus says of the Ninevites that "they repented at (*eis*) the preaching of Jonah." Here it is argued the meaning is that their repenting is—as it were—put within the limits of the preaching of Jonah, especially referring to that, in the more precise sense that they repented with reference to his preaching as the occasion, very well expressed in English by "at," that it is almost impossible to suppose that some persons repented in order that another man might preach. This sense of *eis*, it is claimed, is *absolutely necessary*. But here again we have an assumed *necessity* pleaded as a justification of a meaning of *eis*, which, we contend, confounds it with *dia*, and which, according to highest authority, it never has. It requires us to understand that *the preaching of Jonah was the "ground," or "occasion," of the repentance of the Ninevites*, or, more properly, that through which as a "means," agency, or secondary cause they were induced to repent, not, indeed, because *eis* properly means "ground of," or "occasion," still less "by means of," by the "agency of," in the sense of intermediate cause, but "because of the necessity of the case." But if it can be shown that there is no such *necessity*, but that the passage gives good sense when *eis* is made to retain its proper signification, than the reasoning fails, and the rendering should be abandoned. Let us take the passage term by term, and apply to it the acknowledged grammatical principle under which it comes. In the sentence—"they repented"—the repenting is described by *eis* as having a relative position, or direction; or, let us say, as it is a mental act, *tendency* of "in," "within" the accusative case, expressed by the phrase "the preaching of Jonah." The "preaching of Jonah" denotes the object "with regard" to which it has this relative tendency, and the effect is to represent the Ninevites, who are the subject of the repentings, as brought "into," or "within" the conditions or circumstances required or described in the preaching of Jonah. Thus by a strict application of a plain principle of grammar, we reach this interpretation of this passage, namely: That the Ninevites, through their repentance, were brought within the conditions or requirements of Jonah's preaching. Jonah's preaching required certain things, and, with a view to these, they repented. This interpretation not only gives good sense, but it preserves the universal sense of *eis*, and makes the preaching of Jonah the *terminus ad quem*, with a view to which the Ninevites repented. They did not, it is true, do the ridiculous thing of repenting in order that Jonah might preach, but they did repent, not that their *repentance* might be brought "within" the preaching, but that *they themselves* might be brought within its terms and conditions, and thus escape the wrath which he denounced against them.

Taking, as we do, the broad negative position that "*eis*" is *never used to express the antecedent ground, or occasion*, either as "the reason of," or "the

means of" an action, it is proper to explain that there are some examples, both in the Scriptures and in the classics, which are apparent exceptions, not because of any grammatical law, but from the peculiar nature of the example. The peculiarity consists in this: The preaching—as in the case we have just considered—may be contemplated in two aspects. *First*, as furnishing the "ground," "reason," or "occasion" of the repenting, or, that by "means of," or by "the agency of" which it is induced; and *second*, as presenting the circumstances or conditions to which the repentance looks or tends, and into which it brings the penitent. Now, when the example presents this peculiarity, how does the critical translator determine in which of these two senses the preaching is contemplated? Clearly, only by the *preposition and case which are used*. If *dia*, with the genitive, is used, then the meaning is that the Ninevites, were induced to repent by the preaching of Jonah, specifically by means of it, as the "occasion," or secondary cause. If *dia*, with the accusative, is used, then the meaning is "materially the same, only it is reached in a different way." (*Har.* p. 208.) But if *eis*, with its case, is used, then the meaning is that already stated as contemplated in the *second* aspect of the case.

That *dia*, and not *eis*, would have been used in connection with "the preaching of Jonah," if it had been the intention of the Saviour to convey the idea that the preaching was the antecedent "ground" of the repenting, or the means by which it was induced, is plainly shown by several parallel examples which we take from the Scriptures. In 2 Corinthians viii. 8, it is said, "I speak not by commandment, but by *occasion* (*dia*) of the forwardness of others." Again, 1 Corinthians i. 21, "It pleased God *by* (*dia*) the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Here the foolishness of preaching is the *secondary cause*, or *occasion*, and in both of these examples *dia*, with the genitive, is used. Had our Saviour intended to say that the preaching of Jonah was the "occasion" of the Ninevites' repenting, would he not have used "*dia* the preaching" in the genitive? But Romans iii. 25, furnishes us with a still clearer illustration of the difference between *dia* and *eis*: "Whom God set forth as a propitiation *through* (*dia*, with the genitive) faith in His blood, for (*eis*) the exhibition of his righteousness, because of (*dia*, with the accusative) remission of sins before committed," etc. Here we have both prepositions in the same verse, the one (*dia*) to express the relation of "intermediate cause," or "the reason," the other (*eis*) "with a view to," or the *terminus ad quem*. Can criticism demand or affirm anything clearer or more conclusive than this? When the end in view, the *terminus ad quem*, which is the exhibition of His righteousness, is intended, it is introduced by *eis*; but when it is intended to state the "ground" or "reason" of this, which is "the remission of sins before committed," then *dia*, with the accusative, is used. Paul means to say that the fact that God had remitted sins before the sacrifice of Christ was made was a cause or reason for His setting Him forth as a propitiation to the end, or with the view (*eis*) that His righteousness might be made manifest. Because (*dia*) God had remitted sins before the sacrifice of Christ was made, therefore, *with a view to* (*eis*) the manifestation of His righteousness, He set forth Christ as a propitiation, etc.

Another passage in which it is thought *eis* is used to express the occasion, ground, or reason of the action in the verb with which it is connected is found in Acts xxv. 20, where it is said, "And I, Festus, being perplexed *in regard to* (*eis*) the dispute about those things," etc. But there is no "necessity" for forcing *eis* to mean "ground" or "reason" in this case. It is true, Festus might have said he was perplexed or troubled because

the dispute or discussion had occurred, but in this case he could have used *dia*, and the declaration would have been creditable to him; but he did not say this, nor can we suppose he felt it. The thing that troubled him was the fact that he had to investigate it; it was something that lay before him in the future that troubled him. It is a common style of speaking for a judge, when he has a difficult case to decide, to say he is perplexed, not because the case has arisen, but with a view to the duty and responsibility laid upon him to decide it. Relieve him of this future difficulty and responsibility, and his perplexity is at once ended. A man is often perplexed to-day in anticipation of the duties and obligations of to-morrow. Those duties have had a cause in the past, true; but it is not that to which the perplexity looks; its *terminus ad quem* is the obligation, the difficulty and harassing duty of the future. It was because this was the trouble with Festus that he was anxious to have Paul "go up to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these matters." He cared nothing about the matter, save as he was perplexingly brought into it by his duty as a judge, and because he wished to say this definitely he used *eis*. Dr. Lechler (in Lange's great work) translates this passage, "But as I was at a loss as to this investigation," thus giving to *eis* its precise force, and showing that Festus was troubled *with a view to* the difficult question which lay before him for decision.

Several examples have been culled from the fields of classic Greek, but they are all easily dealt with by the principles of criticism which we have applied to the examples cited from the Scriptures. We need not weary the reader with repeated analyses where the principle is so easy of application, but before we proceed to another line of argument let us recall what has already been done.

We have given a full tabular view of all the meanings of *eis*, but it has not been our purpose to give illustrative examples of each. We have been particularly concerned, *first*, to ascertain its meaning in those passages in which it is used in the Scriptures to express the relation between baptism and the remission of sins. In discussing these we lay down this affirmative proposition in the identical words of Dr. Harrison:* "When *eis* is added to the action or motion of the verb, or to any substantive idea that may imply these, and regard is had to the accusative case following, there arises from the conjunction of the preposition with its sense of 'in' or 'within,' of the action or motion of the verb with its now defined direction, and of the accusative case, with its power of marking the limits within which the action or motion is confined, the sense of 'into,' and the effect is to represent the subject of the action or motion as brought within the circumscribed space, class or category, state or circumstances named by the noun in the accusative." This we adopt as the *regulative principle* for interpreting all cases that come under its description, and claim that the passages in the Scriptures in which *eis* is used to express the relation between baptism and the remission of sins *are all precisely such cases*. This position, we believe, cannot be fairly and successfully assailed.

In the *second* place we advanced the negative position, which we now explicitly state thus: "*Eis* never looks backward to point out the 'ground,' 'reason,' or 'antecedent motive' of the action expressed by the verb in connection with it, but always forward." The special intention of this negative position is to meet the erroneous interpretation of the phrase

* We quote Dr. H. because we regard his work on Greek prepositions as, beyond all comparison, the fullest and most exhaustive discussion of these important little words ever given to the English reader.

"baptism for the remission of sins," by which it is made to mean "baptism *because* sins have been remitted;" that is to say, that the force of *eis* is to indicate that the ground or antecedent motive of the action is the fact that sins had been remitted. We believe that no exception to this universal negative can be found, and have shown, in those that have been adduced, that the interpretation put upon them is erroneous, and confounds *eis* with *dia* in a way utterly unwarranted by accurate criticism. But let it be distinctly observed that, even could an example be found contradictory of this universal negative, it would not invalidate our universal affirmative unless it could be shown that it is also a direct contradiction to it.

We think it evident that the attempt to give to *eis* in this connection, a meaning which does not legitimately belong to it, is the result of *opinion* rather than of sound *criticism*. A theological notion is substituted for the plain language of Scripture, and the passage is made to yield a meaning in harmony with the former instead of with the critical interpretation of the latter. The method is false, and the conclusion reached is, in some instances, absurd. For example, when it is said, "John came preaching the baptism of repentance for (*eis*) the remission of sins," if we make *eis* mean "the ground" or "reason," then the interpretation must be that John preached the baptism of repentance because sins had been forgiven! And again, when it is said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you for (*eis*) the remission of sins," the meaning must be that they were to repent because their sins had been forgiven! But this is absurd, and an absurdity logically drawn from given premises is a demonstration that at least one of the premises is false.

This method of making our views of the general teaching of the Bible a criterion for determining the meaning of Greek words, makes an open door for the wildest license in interpreting the Word of God. It is an inflexible canon of interpretation that admits of no exceptions, that "*nothing shall be elicited from the text but what is yielded by the fair grammatical explanation of the language.*" "We must not," says Luther, "make God's Word what we wish; we must not bend it, but allow it to bend us, and give it the honour of being better than we could make it; so that we must let it stand." Ernesti says: "The system of deducing the sense of words from the matter is altogether fallacious; matter ought rather to be deduced from the words, and from their sense rightfully investigated." Melancthon says: "Scripture cannot be understood theologically unless it be understood, first, grammatically." Again Luther says: "The knowledge of the sense can be derived from nothing but the knowledge of the words."

"Opinion, or the analogy of the doctrine, as it is called," says Ernesti, "can be applied to interpretation only thus far, that in words which are ambiguous, either from the variety of significations, or from the structure, or from some other cause, it may lead us to the choice of a signification. But even then we must be careful that the opinions which we use for determining the sense be drawn from plain, perspicuous, and well-known words in other passages, and that they do not oppose the words whose sense we are investigating. Where this caution is not used, and where opinion and analogy are alone used, without any attention to grammatical principles, nothing more is effected than that a sense is determined which, though it may not be absurd in itself, does not exist in the words, and was not in the mind of the author." Bretschneider lays down these principles: "1. That neither Theology nor Philosophy ought to exercise any influence on an interpreter. 2. That an interpreter is not to consider the

logical propriety of the sense, as discovered by the historico-dogmatic process, but must leave all such considerations for the dogmatic theologian. 3. That he is not to shrink from apparent inconsequence, or inconsistency, in the sense which he has satisfactory hermeneutical reasons for giving to the text." Who can deny that these canons are necessary, unless we are to make *opinion* the basis and test of revelation, instead of the *Word*, as spoken by the inspiration of the Spirit?

[To be concluded next month.]

WHAT IS TRUTH?—A PRIMARY QUESTION.

WHEN, however, we have made up our minds as to the importance of seeking in every case for truth, with an unprejudiced mind, the greatest difficulty still remains, which arises from the confidence we are apt to feel that we have already done this, and have sought for truth with success. For every one must of course be convinced of the truth of his own opinion, if it be properly called *his* opinion; and yet the variety of men's opinions furnishes a proof how many must be mistaken. If any one, then, would guard against mistakes as far as his intellectual faculties will allow, he must make it, *not the second, but the first question* in each case, "Is this true?" It is not enough to believe what you maintain: you must maintain what you believe, and maintain it *because* you believe it, and that on the most careful and impartial review of the evidence on both sides. For any one may bring himself to believe almost anything that he is inclined to believe, and thinks it becoming or expedient to maintain. To express the same maxim in other words: it is one thing to *wish to have truth on our side*, and another thing to wish sincerely to be *on the side of truth*. There is no genuine love of truth implied in the former. Truth is a powerful auxiliary, such as every one wishes to have on his side; every one is rejoiced to find, and therefore often succeeds in convincing himself, that the principles he is already disposed to adopt, the notions he is inclined to defend, may be maintained as true. A determination to "obey the truth," and to follow wherever she may lead, is not so common. In this consists the genuine love of truth; and this can be realized in practice only by *postponing* all other questions to that which ought ever to come foremost, "What is the truth?" The minds of most men are *pre-occupied* by some feeling or other which influences their judgment, either on the side of truth or of error, as it may happen, and enlists their learning and ability on the side, whatever it may be, which they are pre-disposed to adopt.

One of the most common of these feelings is an aversion to *doubt*—a dislike of having the judgment kept in suspense, which, combined with indolence in investigation, induces the great mass of mankind to *make up their minds* on a variety of points, almost according to the first suggestion that is offered. As the illustrious Greek historian expresses it, in language which will hardly admit of an adequate translation, the generality of mankind are so averse to the labour of investigating truth, that they are willing rather to adopt any statement that is ready prepared for their acceptance. But he who would cultivate a habitual devotion to truth, must be solicitous in the first place to avoid error, and consequently must in all cases prefer *doubt* to the reception of falsehood, or to the admission of any conclusion on insufficient evidence. One who has an aversion to doubt, and is anxious to make up his mind, and to come to *some* conclu-

sion on every question that is discussed, must be content to rest many of his opinions on very slight grounds, since no one individual is competent to investigate fully all disputed points. Such a one, therefore, is no lover of truth, nor is in the right way to attain it on any point. *He* may more reasonably hope this, who, though he may on many points perceive some (and perhaps a great) preponderance of probability on this or that side, is contented to come to a decisive conclusion only on those few which he has been enabled thoroughly to investigate.—*Whately*.

THE REALITY OF THE INCARNATION.

“And the Word was made flesh.” John i. 14.

THE great fact of the Incarnation has two sides—the Divine and the human. These may be pointed out by two questions. First, *Who* became flesh? Answer: the Divine “Word,”—and this reveals the Divine side of the Incarnation. Second, *What* did the Word *become*? Answer: “flesh,”—and this brings to view the human side of the Incarnation.

In proportion as it is important to hold the *reality* of the stupendous FACT itself, is it important to grasp with equal tenacity both sides of it.

The high consequence of not letting its *Divine* side escape us will be seen when we remember that to lose our hold on *that* were to lose altogether the truly Divine majesty of our Lord's person. If merely a human child was born in Bethlehem, then was there no Incarnation at all: if a mere created being assumed our nature of the Virgin, still we have no Divine Redeemer,—a Creature may have become Incarnate, but the Incarnate Creature is a Creature still. We can no longer think of the personal love of our Redeemer as an *eternal* love; can no longer permit our minds to invest the Pre-Incarnate One with *infinite* riches; must cease to wonder and adore, as we have been wont, in view of an *infinite* condescension to the cradle, the cross, and the realms of Death. The blood of Calvary will have only a limited value—if, indeed, any value, available for us; and it will henceforth become doubtful whether a Creature can so far exceed the claims of law, as to bring in, for a lost World, a Substitutionary Sacrifice. Whereas, wonder may continue to gaze, and faith still repose in full security, and love burn on with undying flame, and joy burst out anew to sing the old song which yet can never weary,—if the mystery of human redemption involve this: That He who was before and above all creature-law voluntarily placed Himself under law, and He who was Himself Uncreate did, in the fulness of time, stoop to be born of a human mother—Himself now a little, genuine, human Babe.

This brings us to the human side of the Incarnation, on which we purpose setting down a few thoughts, more in detail, partly springing from the persuasion that, on this very side of it, the great fact has become, to many minds, in measure *unreal*.

The Incarnation of the Divine Word implies the following among other particulars:—

1. He was *limited by weakness*. Mark what is said: “And the Word became *flesh*.” Why “*flesh* :” why not *man*? Because the term *flesh* denotes manhood in its frailty: “All flesh is grass.” The Word did not, then, become man, in manhood's primal power; or in manhood's ultimate perfection; but in manhood's humbled, trembling frailty. And first a babe—the very symbol of weakness. The child given to us did truly hang on its mother's breast, was really folded in its mother's arms, and was indeed protected and nurtured by its mother's care. It was no monster babe,

with infinite ideas coursing through its precocious brain, or almighty impulses straining to agony its delicate and sensitive nerves. How do I know this? Because I honestly believe this dear babe in Mary's arms to be a true, human babe. The monster-stories of the Infancy and Childhood all belong to the Apocryphal Gospels, which in these very legends carry written their own condemnation. According to the inimitably simple narratives of our Evangelists, the Child is "*really given to us*;" and we cannot, will not, *thus* part with it. It touches our tenderness to the quick to see that lovely babe fondly stroke its mother's bosom, as other babes do; and then fall into a peaceful slumber, just as our own infants are wont. Oh! say not that it is profane in us to see anything so simply natural; for, truly, it is when *thus* we look, and BELIEVE, that we most wonder and adore. The child sweetly sleeps: we can see nothing but frail loveliness—*nothing* to tell us that this is more than any other babe. Seeing this,—no more,—we *believe* that this is the Eternal Word made flesh! How complete the fact! how unreserved the condescension! how entire the self-emptying and humiliation.

And surely we *may* see the weakness of the Babe, since the Apostle Paul saw the weakness of the Man—even the Crucified Man: "For even if," says Paul, "He was crucified out of weakness, on the contrary He is living out of God's power." 2 Cor. xiii. 4). So then the Incarnate Word "was crucified out of weakness." Had He not truly become "flesh,"—*could* He have been crucified at all?

2. He was *capable of growth*. Notwithstanding that the inference is inevitable and the testimony express, yet how lightly do we treat this fact,—that the child Jesus "grew" both in body and in mind. The inference is inevitable; for what have we but *growth* to connect the Childhood and the Manhood in one, true, living personality? And the testimony is express—preserved for us, (and this itself is noteworthy) by "the beloved physician," Luke: "And the child was growing, and waxing strong, in process of being filled* with wisdom, and God's favour was upon it" (ii. 40). Only as we abide by the reality of the Incarnation, on its human side, can we make way for advancing wisdom, as well as advancing stature and strength. To do simplest justice to the story, we must make way for the conception of genuine growth. Why, for example, hide the reason of Mary's surprise when she found the Boy in the Temple? *He had never been so found before!* Or, why hesitate to see in the Boy's answer, if not the dawn of a new thought, at least the revelation of a power in that thought which it had never before asserted? Not the least remarkable aspect of that answer is the very circumstance, that whereas it expressed a relationship to God not previously realised in Israel,† and was a truly wonderful and significant utterance, it yet bears upon its face a genuine boyish simplicity. Its *naïveté* is unapproachable, and for ever stamps it with a mark of inimitable truth. It is simply and absolutely becoming to the lips of One only—the Word made flesh when a Boy!

3. He was *susceptible of temptation*. We know that he was tempted. What it behoves us to learn is, that our Lord did more than go through a form of being tempted. It is not merely that evil was presented to him; but that the presented evil was temptation, was enticement, was seen and felt to be enticing. How this could be in the experience of One so absolutely sinless as was the Holy Jesus, we may be quite unable to explain,

* So the imperfect participle, *πληρουόμενον*, implies.

† *Renan* admits that it was an original conception: that Jesus could not have learned it from any one.

in detail; but we know it must have been so. We can derive no consolation from our Master's triumph over temptation, if we permit ourselves to doubt for a moment that evil offered to him allurements. It presents allurements to us. It is temptation to us just to the extent that it is enticement. Our merciful High-priest was tempted in all points like as we are; and though we may not be able to give *detailed* explanation, yet there is one general explanation which we can give,—we can say: "The Word became flesh!" Here, indeed, we might leave this difficult matter; preferring to stop short abruptly, rather than use a single inappropriate expression; but, in truth, our strong sense of the reality of the Incarnation may lead us to hope that even this phase of its reality may open itself up more fully to our apprehension. Of one thing we may be well assured, namely, that the fuller apprehension of this matter must be sought for along the line of the weakness of our own flesh—of the common flesh of our humanity. Could we but steadily distinguish between the weakness of our flesh and its *sinfulness*, we could be more bold to draw the Incarnate One in his temptations nearer to ourselves. In very deed, we do so urgently need an increased nearness to Him that we must venture the attempt. Well, then, let us put it to ourselves thus: "The Word became flesh," and flesh is weak; and its weakness (*as well as* its sinfulness—*apart* from its sinfulness) gives place and power to temptation. But how so? How does the weakness of our flesh give place and power to temptation? Partly, at least, for the following reason: The evil thing comes before us in *more than one aspect*—more than its *evil aspect*; and perhaps the first aspect in which it offers itself to our view is *not* its evil aspect; but, say, its pleasurable aspect; and, along with this, its feasible aspect; the pleasurable thing is within reach,—take it! Ah! but it is forbidden, it is wrong: not absolutely wrong, perhaps; but now—here—thus—it is wrong. Consequently it must be declined. But may it not involve a *conflict* to decline the evil thing—however prompt the resistance, however decisive the victory, however unsullied the heart, however unaccusable the conscience? We feel sure that it might, that the mere weakness of our flesh might involve us in a conflict; we feel sure that, just in consequence of our frailty, we might find the susceptibilities of our nature, so to speak, going forth to meet the desirable qualities of the evil thing, and getting entangled in them, before the evil—the forbidden—the wrong—aspect comes into view; before the mind shall have had *time* to direct itself to the sinfulness of the thing, *time* to set itself in the attitude of resistance. Under these circumstances there may be temptation, even though there is no sin. By reason of the weakness of the flesh, all sides of the object are not seen with equal clearness at one and the same instant; all its influences are not at once felt with equal force. First, as a desirable thing, desired—it has then, as a forbidden thing, to be refused. The incipient desire must be repressed, denied, crucified, crushed. But this is conflict, this is temptation. We seem thus to stand on safe ground. Not as an evil thing forbidden—wrong—are we supposing the object desired; but as, in itself, naturally a thing to be delighted in. May we apply these thoughts to our holy, but tempted, Redeemer? I think that, with reverence, we may. Jesus was hungry, and His hunger was keen and craving. To the hungering Jesus, the idea of food was presented; and I must assume, that to him, then and there, encompassed with the weakness of my nature, the idea of food was pleasant—it stirred the desire of the flesh. And the desirable thing was feasible; the Son of God had power to transform the stone into a loaf.

But the desirable, feasible thing was not right! No matter whether we can say *why* it was not right; we are sure that to our lowly, suffering Master, who never exerted his power over nature for His own comfort, it appeared *not right*. It was enough; the reply was, No! That is, the temptation was resisted and overcome. But not—and this is our point—not until it had been realised as a temptation; which is the same thing as to say: Not until it had presented itself in successive aspects to His mind, and had succeeded in making successive *impressions* upon His mind, in a manner which we can appreciate, because we experience it in our temptations. But did our Lord, in very deed, descend to such a state of susceptibility to temptation, a state so like our own? Our reply is: The Incarnation was a reality. It is most true that "The Word became flesh."

4. He was sustained by *spiritual means of replenishment*. There appears no more reason to doubt this than there is to doubt that, being physically hungry or weary, He was refreshed and invigorated by food and sleep. Can we consistently hold that while His body did indeed become worn, His mind knew no fatigue, His spirit was never jaded? Surely not. Besides, even if we could, what would be the result? It would be just this: We should have presented to us an *un-human* Jesus, one who clearly did not pass through "the feeling of our infirmities." On the other hand, grant that our Lord knew what wear and tear of spirit was,—from large expenditure of spiritual sympathy, from the forth putting of abundant spiritual labour, from incessant and loftily sustained resistance against evil in all even its most subtle forms and combinations,—grant this, and the spectacle of a praying Jesus, rising early for prayer and continuing long in it, becomes so much the more intelligible. It has a definable object. Jesus prayed because He had need. He asked that He might have. He received that He might give. Do not let us cheat ourselves out of this blessed fellowship with our Elder Brother. Do not let us put ourselves off with the thought that the prayers of Jesus were mere communings with His Father, that they were not petitions springing from a sense of need. We are positively assured that "*in the days of His flesh, He offered both petitions and supplications unto Him who was able to save Him out of death,—with mighty crying and tears.*" (Heb. v. 7). This particular statement may have special reference to Gethsemane; but the significant way in which it is said to have been "*in the days of His flesh*" that He thus prayed quite forbids our limiting its general import to any single occasion. Once right with regard to the *praying* Jesus, we shall not hesitate to think of Him as *reading* also. Who indeed could seriously imagine our Lord, only in public reading the Sixty-first of Isaiah? Who could for a moment suppose that Psalm Twenty-second and first was recited on the Cross only? It is true that His own Spirit had inspired the Prophets (1 Peter i. 11);—but who, then, should respond to its Voice as Himself—"in the days of His flesh," and amid the trials of His "humiliation?" Must not He who was "under law" have listened to the Law? "They sang an hymn":—more literally, "they sang praise;" not one hymn merely, but doubtless the accustomed Psalms.* Who sang? We are sure there was One Voice not silent (compare Ps. xxii. 22); or, if silent, only because choked with emotion, in contemplation of the wonderful coincidences and contrasts, centering in Himself, which for instance, Ps. cxviii. contained. Whether on this peerless occasion, or in the ordinary synagogue worship,—how can we

* The *hymn* was in all probability the last part of the Hallel, or great Hallel, which consisted of Psalms cxv—cxviii; the former part (Ps. cxiii. cxiv) having been sung during the meal.—*Alford*.

possibly think of the FATHER'S SON taking no part; or, taking part, doing it—*unblest*? You remind me that to Him had been given the Spirit without measure. Even so, But the question is whether the Spirit which the Father bestowed on His Beloved, without stint of unsatisfied reserve or hindrance of unreceptive mind, was not after all given with accommodation to the humble condition to which its Recipient had stooped. There can be but one answer: Those days, succeeding to the heavenly Anointing, were still the days of the Messiah's flesh, the days of His weakness, the days of His need, the days of His prayers, the days of His replenishment by the means provided by God in Israel. We therefore conclude that, abundantly as the Spirit rested on the Christ, the result was, not a lifting Him above means, but an unhindered working in Him through means. Jesus was, indeed, Himself the true Israel (Is. xlix. 3), who "halted" in the weakness of the "flesh" at the very time that, by His agonising but believing and submissive prayer, He had princely strength with God and prevailed.

5. He was *matured to perfection*. This we may without difficulty admit, if only we keep in mind, that perfection may be relatively viewed. The manhood of Jesus was imperfect in His boyhood, His boyhood imperfect in His infancy. If He learned obedience by the things which He suffered, then there must have been a time when the lesson had not as yet been learnt. It was by the painful learning of the lesson that He was perfected (Heb. v. 9). There was ever a perfect readiness to learn the lesson: still the lesson *was learnt*. The perfection acquired was that of human experience: this experience, wrought out in the fire of utmost trial, removed the only imperfection attributable to our Saviour, namely, that of inexperience. He is now perfect in the sense of having perfectly learned in the school of experience the lesson assigned Him. The glorious result is, that we have a perfect Example, a perfect Sacrifice, a perfect High-priest, a perfect Saviour. The Incarnate One, experimentally perfected, here, on this earth, amidst a world's sins and sighs, amidst His own toils and tears, will be a marvel to all worlds for ever.

6. He was *fitted for sympathy and confidence*. He was fitted for such sympathy as to inspire our confidence. Sin He abhors; but He knows from experience what temptation means. He knows that it is no trifling thing that temptation—subtle, various, recurring, protracted—encompasses and waylays us. And, though in no case can He become an excuser of sin, yet He so thoroughly knows the perils of the conflict against it that He would have no man go forth in his own name and strength to the fight. He would have the man with troubled conscience, by reason of unforgiven sin, come and wash all his sins away in His blood: that so the joy of the Lord may be his strength in striving against sin. He would have the frail sons and daughters of Adam be brought into vital union with Himself, be filled with the holy energy of the Spirit which He is ready to bestow, that so they may be strengthened with might in the inner man,—and thus go forth to the warfare. To the unsaved He gives no encouragement to dream for an instant that they will succeed in resisting the evil one so long as they *remain* unsaved, unpardoned, unarmed. His only cry to them is, Oh ye beleaguered ones, come unto Me! Even for His accepted ones, He feels deep solicitude. He would not have them gratuitously enter temptation. Compelled to enter, He would not have them self-confident; but watchful, circumspect, alive to danger, ready to resist, still more ready to flee. All this, and much more, because of His sympathy. He Himself was watching and praying at the very time that He told

His disciples to "watch and pray:" He was ready Himself to sink under the weakness of the flesh when He said: "The spirit indeed is wishful, but the flesh weak."—Oh, then, shall we respond to His sympathy, by confiding to Him our weakness, danger, fear? From *Him*, let us not shrink: He will not chide. Let us tell Him all: *He* will not, like Eli, mistake the meaning of our faltering lip. 'Tis true, our great High-priest has passed through the heavens; but He is still the same as when on earth: He has not unlearned the lesson of the life that He lived in the days of His flesh when in all intimacy, lowliness, and hardships, He tabernacled amongst us.

London, May 2nd, 1870.

JOSEPH B. ROTHERHAM.

MINISTRY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.—No. VI.

DEACONS.

"To all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Phil. i.

THE word *deacon* is found in the New Testament only in Phil. i. and 1 Tim. iii.; five occurrences in all. It comes from the Greek *διάκονος*, an attendant, servant, or minister. The verb *διακονέω* signifies to wait upon, to serve. A deacon, then, is one who serves, a servant.

Though in the English New Testament we have *deacon* only five times, there are some thirty occurrences of *διάκονος* in the original. There is no good reason for rendering the few texts in question differently from the larger number. The term is applied—1. To the Saviour himself. Rom. xv. 8, Gal. ii. 17; 2. To the Apostles. Matt. xx, 26, 1 Cor. iii. 5, 2 Cor. iii. 6, vi. 4; 3. To Evangelists. Eph. vi. 21, Col. i. 7, 1 Tim. iv. 6; 4. To any faithful servant of the Lord. John xii. 26; 5. To magistrates. Rom. xiii. 4; 6. To servants at feasts, &c. Matt. xxii. 13, John ii. 5, 9.

In its generic sense, then, it represents a *servant*, without regard to rank or quality of service. Jesus, Paul, and Phœbe are designated by the one term; which applies alike to preachers, magistrates, and waiters.

But in addition to the foregoing numerous applications of *διάκονος* in its primary signification, it is, most certainly, used in an appropriated and more limited sense, and thus designates a particular class of ministrants appertaining to the Church of Christ. This is clear from the following texts:—

"Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Phil. i. 1.

"Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless. Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. For they that have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. iii. 8-13.

"And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch: whom they set before the apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands upon them." Acts vi. 1-6.

From the *first* of these three passages we learn that the deacons of the Philippian Church were distinguished from the members in general, and also from the bishops, and that, therefore, the word is not there used in its wide, or generic, sense, but is appropriated to designate certain persons to whom there had been committed some special service. The *second* passage shows that there was an office in the church filled by persons to whom this term, in its appropriated and limited sense, was applied, and that for said office certain qualifications and testing were imperatively demanded. The *third* cited portion indicates the duties they were required to engage in. They were to wait upon the secular affairs of the church. Nothing of preaching or teaching appertained to their office. They were not to be excluded from ministering in word and doctrine, nor did their office disqualify them for the eldership; but in teaching, preaching, or ruling, they would not act by virtue of their standing as deacons. We also see, that they were specially elected for their work, and duly ordained to the same.

But "extremes beget extremes!" Hence while on the one hand some have perverted a few texts, to make the deacon a clergyman—a priest in embryo—others deny the office altogether. Plymouth-brethrenism rushes off to the last extreme. Beverly says, that, "Any believing man or woman, who serves the Lord and His people is a deacon or minister. Paul was in this sense a deacon. (1 Thes. iii. 2.) Phœbe was a deacon. (Rom. xvi. 1.) Apollos was a deacon. (1 Cor. iii. 5). All those who were in service to the Lord in the church at Philippi were deacons. (Phil. i. 1.) And indeed if we may imitate the translators of the English Bible, and coin the deacon's office out of the verb *διακονεω*, then all believers have received the gift to exercise the deacon's office one to another, and Paul tells us there are diversities of deacon's offices. (1 Cor. xii. 5)." The same writer undertakes to show that the seven holy men whose election is recorded Acts vi., were not chosen to any permanent office, that they were never called deacons, that if theirs was the deacon's office, then that office must have ceased before the death of the apostles, as it had reference to peculiar local circumstances. But we submit that the circumstances, in their leading features, were not peculiar, but will continue to exist while the Lord's intimation, that the poor we shall always have with us, is applicable. The apostles, as the first evangelists, planted the church in Jerusalem and, consequently, had charge in the department in question, which, in due time—hastened perhaps by peculiar circumstances—they transferred to men chosen by the church. True, the term deacons, or servants, is not applied to the seven, but they were chosen to *serve*, and therefore were the *servants* of God and the brethren. The Church was not called upon to commit this service to all those members who possessed the qualifications specified, but to look out a given number. The seven men elected by the church and ordained by the apostles were, then, the stewards of the church, to receive and disburse its bounty. For such stewards there remains, and will remain, full need. Refuse to call them deacons if you please—call them ministers, servants, or whatever you find authority for calling them; but so long as you have a table to furnish, funds to take care of, poor to help, expenses to meet, some must have charge; the whole church cannot act; and those who act for the church must not be self-chosen. It then remains that the church look out men of wisdom, that they may be "set over this business," or "necessity," and as well may it be said, that baptism and the Lord's Supper arose out of peculiar local circumstances, and, therefore, were not designed to continue as to

draw the like unfounded conclusion in this case. The order then is, that brethren be chosen by the church to take charge of and appropriate its funds, in regard to the particulars above specified, and that the brethren, thus chosen be ordained by prayer and laying on of hands, by those who have charge in that department at the time of the election. The one clear example in Acts vi. shows how the necessity was met, and how it should be provided for so long as it exists : and it will exist so long as we have money to contribute and poor to help.*

The term *deacon*, in its special application to the custodians of the church treasury, seems to have been derived from the synagogue of the Jews, where, usually, there were three persons set apart to collect and appropriate alms. They had charge of the poor-chest provided for Sabbath contributions, and also of the produce of the gleanings of corn-fields and vineyards.

Paul having done the work of an evangelist in planting churches in Ephesus and Crete, left them before they were fully set in order, and therefore, he provided for the election of deacons and the ordination of both deacons and elders by transferring, provisionally, his evangelistic oversight—in Ephesus to Timothy and in Crete to Titus. This circumstance is providentially used to provide for us a statement of the qualifications required in those who are ordained to the deacon's office. The *deacon*, then, must be—1. Grave. 2. Not double-tongued. 3. Not given to much wine. 4. Not greedy of gain. 5. Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. 6. They must be proved before they use the office. 7. They must be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and houses well. 8. Their wives must be grave, not slanderers, sober, and faithful. 1 Tim. iii.

Note, particularly, that before entering upon the office they are to be proved. Hence, generally, deacons cannot be ordained till some time after the planting of a church. They must be known as men of *gravity*, *sobriety*, and *unselfishness*, and noted for their understanding of, and firm adherence to, the faith. How needful these traits in those who are called to minister to the sick and needy of the flock! A double-tongued man may not enter upon this office. How important that one who has to be officially acquainted with delicate family and social affairs should have a tongue that can be depended upon! Not given to wine, frugal, not greedy of gain, but liberal and yet prudent. How needful in those who minister the bounty of the church! A man with an unruly family, or a wife who is not sober and faithful, or who is a slanderer, may not be ordained a deacon. We conclude, too, that an unmarried man is ineligible. Some consider that "husband of one wife" is merely intended to exclude those who have more than one. But, other circumstances being equal, the superior fitness, arising from experience in family relations, is so apparent, that we cannot but urge that deacons should really be "husbands of one wife."

That women filled this honorable office is apparent. Paul wrote: "I commend unto you Phœbe our sister, who is a servant (deaconess) of the Church which is at Cenchrea. That ye receive her in the Lord as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatever business she hath need of you; for she has been a succourer of many, and of myself also." She was, then, in this work of succouring, the servant of one church—that of Cenchrea. The East, owing to the more secluded life of females, would absolutely require that sisters be thus engaged. With us, though not so

* See Ministry. No. V. pp. 160-1.

absolutely necessary, many cases occur which can only be investigated and relieved by female agency; and, therefore, deaconesses should be ordained wherever practicable.

Of the things said, concerning deacons, in this and our former article, this is the sum:—

1. That it is a standing ordinance in the Church that there be persons specially appointed to take charge of and minister the funds of the church, especially in regard to providing for the needy.

2. That the persons filling this office must possess the qualifications enumerated by the apostle; that the office should not be filled till persons are proved thus qualified.

3. That the church elects; while those who have previous charge, in this department of labour, ordain the elected by prayer and the laying on of hands.

4. Deaconesses should be ordained in every Church so soon as practicable.

QUERIES AND OBJECTIONS.

1. "Why should not the elders (bishops), or two or more of them, take charge of the treasury of the church and thus dispense with the election and ordination of deacons?"

ANSWER.

Because it was not so appointed by the Apostles. Paul addressed himself to the "*bishops and deacons*" of the Church in Philippi, and, therefore, the bishops had not committed to them the deacons' office. In writing to Timothy he likewise distinguished between bishops and deacons. We admit that a deacon might fill the bishop's office, in the event of the church so desiring, but not that a bishop can do the work of a deacon by virtue of his standing as an elder.

2. "As the bishops of the church have oversight in every department, have they not power to direct the deacons to assist needy brethren, at such times and to such extent as they consider requisite?"

ANSWER.

Bishops are quite within their office when they exercise careful oversight in the matter of need and supply. They must not be considered to intrude when they make themselves acquainted with income and expenditure and present suggestions to the deacons thereupon. But the deacons are responsible to the church by whom they are elected, and are not bound to carry out the suggested measures. If, however, they are incompetent the bishops should, by reason of their position, be the first to know it and to appeal to the church for such removal or re-appointment as may meet the want, but of that incompetency the church itself is the judge. As, then, the deacons and not the bishops are responsible, the former and not the latter have the right to determine when and how funds entrusted to them shall be expended.

D. K.

CHRIST AT THE WELL OF SAMARIA.

I SHALL only notice some of the incidents in the interview of Jesus with the woman of Samaria. They will afford us a lesson of instruction of great value, that perhaps may be needed in our day, as indeed at all times, among those who are called to be teachers of the Word or preachers of the glad tidings.

The first thing that strikes the mind of the reader, is the gentleness of Christ. As He approaches the Samaritan woman, you see none of the prejudices of the Jew. He saw in her only a woman, a descendant of one common father; a fallen, sinful creature, needing light and salvation. He did not feel towards her as the body of the Jewish people did, with whom they would have no dealings;—"Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil." Every thing a Samaritan touched, in their judgment, was unclean. He was publicly cursed in their synagogues; "could not be adduced in the

Jewish courts as a witness—could not be admitted to any sort of proselytism."

The first words of Jesus to this woman of Samaria were, "Give me to drink." He thus acknowledged His dependence on her,—gave her the privilege of doing Him a favour—placed Himself in relation of a debtor to her; and put her at ease with herself.—Few things will disarm even an enemy so soon as the asking of a common favour,—“Give me to drink.” To the degraded, nothing is so effectual in securing attention as the exercise of some of the ordinary courtesies of life: They feel their situation at times most keenly. They have lost all self-respect, and any one who sees anything in them as worthy of the common recognition of the privileges of humanity, will not fail to touch some latent chord in their hearts. Jesus treated this Samaritan—this degraded Samaritan—with respect, and how instantly it was responded to.

Jesus spoke to her of her sin, but in such a manner as to win her confidence, and disarm her of all prejudice or resentment.—“Go call thy husband.” Jesus knew that she had no lawful husband, and was anxious to make her feel in His presence self-condemned. He acknowledged that she spoke the truth when she said, “I have no husband;” but in so doing He arraigned before her the hidden secrets of her life: and in how few words! “Thou saidst well: I have no husband. For thou hast had five husbands; and he whom thou *now* hast is not thy husband.”

He did not taunt nor condemn her, as others would have done. He did not say, “O, this is due to your religion,” as a true sectarian would have done exultingly, He did not exaggerate her state and become eloquent over the enormity of her wickedness. He understood her case well, and realized fully the folly and guilt involved in it. But where others had reproaches He had tears. Where others gathered stones to hurl at the head of the notoriously wicked, Jesus had forgivenesses. He gave her full credit for all the truth she had spoken, and forced upon her the persuasion that “He was a prophet.”

How much was gained by this? A prophet was in Samaria, and stood face to face with this notorious woman! She had never encountered such a person before. She felt that here is one who knows me. “He has told me all that I ever did.” Jesus could now speak with authority and send the arrows of conviction through the hard incrustations of sin that had gathered round her heart. She was conscious of her own nakedness in the presence of Him who was the revealer to man of his guilt and the ineradicable maladies that reign within. She endeavoured to divert Him from His purpose;—to send Him off on another track by throwing a challenge at His feet: “Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and *ye* say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship.” This was the old question of dispute between the Jew and Samaritan. Doubtless she was skilled in this article of her religion,—that Mount Gerizim was the true mountain, and her temple the true temple. The Jew was ever ready to discuss also a question so vital between the two rival nationalities. They were fired with an unconquerable zeal whenever it was touched upon. Jesus was not thrown off his guard. He merely corrects her mistakes, and warns her of the fate of both mountains and the imminent danger of the peoples worshipping at them; and told her of the fact that “salvation was of the Jews.” And that the worshippers, in spirit, could render God acceptable service any where. *He avoided all controversy with her.* What a fine opportunity was there here for a sharp and exhaustive debate. What zeal might have been manifested for the truth. What im-

portant national questions might have been logically settled between the Jews and Samaritans. The disciples would soon return from the city. They would not only have the benefit of the debate, but the whole city would soon hear of it, and come to the discussions at the "well of Jacob." The Doctors of the law in Jerusalem and the rulers of all the synagogues would soon hear of the extraordinary defeat of the Samaritans; and the Nazarene would mightily grow in their favour. Any Pharisee or Sadducee in Jerusalem, if at all posted up in the arguments *pro* and *con*, would have seized upon the occasion to defend the truth. But Jesus struck at the conscience, and this is never hit in controversy.—The parable of Nathan and "*Thou art the man*," will accomplish far more than all the polemical skill that the most combative disputant can summon to his work. That self knowledge which teaches us humility teaches us compassion for the weaknesses of others. It checks injustice and impatience; and gives us tolerance under the contradictions of the wayward and the ignorant. It is the only antidote to that self-love that bristles under the opposition made to our opinions; and is nearly allied to that "meekness of wisdom" which is the ornament and safeguard of the faithful disciple of Jesus.

He who advocates the cause of Christ should remember that the truth he upholds will not atone for his impertinence, nor the doctrine he teaches justify his uncharitableness, nor the zeal he exhibits make up for his bitterness. The greater the cause for controversy, the greater the necessity for moderation and candour. A judicious silence, often, is of more weight than a warm temper and an intolerant zeal. Our moderation may open the eyes of those who may not be convinced by our arguments; and the temper with which we advocate the truth may be the surest passport to the hearts of our opponents.

It will be impossible to avoid conflict with the enemies of the truth. Indeed, we are "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." But the temptation to indulge in vituperation: in bitterness and clamour, and evil speaking, is so great, that no one needs to covet it. A litigious nature is not an amiable one; and if indulged in will grow to all uncharitableness.—These Goliaths, after all, are only physically strong. They may wear a helmet of brass on their heads, and be armed with a coat of mail, and the staff of their spear be like a weaver's beam.—They may be full of wrath and defiance, but the smooth stone of the brook and the sling of the shepherd will be more than a match for their boasted prowess. The first king of Israel, Saul the son of Kish, was the ideal type of the head and champion of a people sunk in the basest idolatry. He was a young and inexperienced man, sent by his father to look after the asses just escaped from his pasture. In fact, *this* was what by nature and education he was fitted to do. But he was a head and shoulder taller than any man of all the tribes; and this, in their estimation, was his chief recommendation. God let them have their own way;—for, said he, "they have rejected me." He told them what "manner" of a king he should be. He was a bold, boastful, intemperate and rash fighter,—the very personification of animalism. In the greatest battle that he fought, and after the most signal victory he won, the shepherd boy slew his ten thousands, while Saul only slew his thousands.

If our numerous discussions with the pen and the tongue have done much to disabuse the public mind of error and prejudice, how much more would the interests of truth have been maintained, if, with a zeal according to knowledge, we had sent the gospel where it is not, and had cultivated the spirit of unity and love: of self-denial and heroic sacrifice in the cause

of the Redeemer. I cannot but think that if we had sent missionaries to Europe and Asia, to Africa and the islands of the seas; and if *now* we would send out an organized band of disciples to the Freedmen of the South, as teachers of schools and preachers of the word: if we had been untiring in our devotion to Christ and His cause—our numbers and our efficiency would be increased a hundred fold. Shall we ever get beyond the primer in the school of Christ, or must we always fight the Sanballats and Tobias, and never build up the walls of the Great City? I don't know whether we shall ever destroy all the error that is in this most disjointed world. Certainly the serpents that Hercules was sent to crush were not the creatures that an infant's hand could strangle. It is a most discouraging fact that of old, they grew as fast as their heads were decapitated. Killing monsters of strange device may be the calling of some, but saving men through the power of the gospel, should be the work of all.

JAS. CHALLEN.

Reviews, Notes, Passing Events, &c.

PLAIN WORDS.—A Christian Miscellany. Edited by the Rev. H. MAGEE. Moffat, London.

A WELL got up Monthly in the interest of popular Protestantism. The May issue came to hand with the request, that any notice in our pages be sent to the publisher. We really commend this little serial as likely to prove highly acceptable to those Protestants who are satisfied with Church of England and Presbyterian Protestantism. It is well written, liberal, comprehensive, and quite disposed to deal heavy blows upon the Papacy.

A characteristic article appears under the heading, "Is Protestantism able to maintain itself in Ireland?" This article is also published separately, and free grants can be had, on application to the Editor, by those who undertake to distribute judiciously. The first section of this article we give entire.

I. WHAT IS PROTESTANTISM?

The word "Protestantism" conveys the idea of opposition—that and nothing more. As a religious system, therefore, Protestantism, unless it overflows the letter of its name, would be simply an antagonism to another religious system. It would teach a set of negations merely; and if it failed to maintain itself in Ireland, the loss would not probably be great.

Protestantism is not a system of mere negation. If it protests and pulls down, it also affirms and establishes. It gives a

prominent place to all the great central truths taught by the Church of Rome. It holds (for example) with undying tenacity, the doctrine of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, of the Atonement, of the Resurrection, &c. Protestants receive all that is contained in the "Apostles' Creed." They receive the doctrinal decisions of the earliest Councils, because conformable to Scripture. What is "founded upon or necessarily deducible from" the written, infallible, and unchangeable Word of God, Protestantism accepts. Whatever is contrary to it, it rejects.

A distinguished member of a Protestant Church boasted, "Nobody has yet appeared who could prove that we have altered any one thing which God has commanded; or that we have appointed any new thing contrary to His Word; or that we have turned aside from the truth to follow any evil opinion." In so far as the boast is well founded, the idea of Protestantism is realized.

Whenever, therefore, we speak or think correctly of Protestantism,—distinct, positive principles come to the front. They cannot be too often repeated. They cannot be too firmly held and acted on. The first is,—all that deserves the name of religion—all that is accepted by God as religion, and all that is required in order to a sinner's salvation—is revealed by God in His written Word. And the second (of equal importance) is—the individual soul is accepted of Him, only (but always) in truth, and from the heart, believing what is so revealed, and yielding obedience to what is so enjoined.

Can such a religious system hold its ground in Ireland?

We are next informed that Protestantism, as thus defined, is by no means contemptible in Ireland—that according to the last census there were then more than 1,300,000 such Protestants—that this Protestant army will have, for the future, to pay for their own worship, “as Roman Catholics have done for hundreds of years, and as the Apostolic Church did for the first three centuries.” Well done Irish Protestantism. At last, then, you have, in an important particular, come up to the level of the Romish Church, which for centuries, in that particular, has accorded with the Apostolic Church, while you have been entirely discordant. And yet, you boasted then, as you do now, in the Bible as your only rule of faith and practice.

Now, we beg to point out to the Editor of *Plain Words*, that the recently Disestablished Irish Church and its Presbyterian neighbour are not Protestant according to the definition and claim put in by the article under notice. “There is vitality enough in this old Bible Christianity of ours to survive a greater catastrophe than that,” is said in reference to the recent disestablishment. But the specified Protestant Churches are not in accord with the “old Bible Christianity.” That the doctrine of those Churches is immeasurably better than that of Rome is freely admitted—that in certain great points those Churches are in accord with the Bible and in opposition to Papal corruption is gladly avowed. But something more than that is needful to bring them to the “Old Bible Christianity,” and within the moderately acceptable definition of Protestantism, supplied by the article, which indicates two

of its important constituents:—1. It accepts what is necessarily deducible from the written Word of God. 2. It rejects whatever is contrary to that Word. To which the boast is added, that, “nobody has yet appeared who could prove that we have altered any one thing that God has recommended; or that we have appointed any new thing contrary to His Word.” Now this Protestantism did for hundreds of years in Ireland, and still does in England, depart from the constitution of the Church of Christ and from “Old Bible Christianity,” by selling its liberty to the state, and thereby placing its worship under the control of a parliament composed of Romanists, Anglicans, Nonconformists, and Infidels. Was the Apostolic Church a State Church? Is there Bible precept or example in favour of placing the Church of Christ in such relation to the State as to give headship therein to the chief magistrate, the regulation of its worship to a worldly parliament, and the appointment of its bishops to a political party? There is not! These so-called Protestants, then, are not in harmony with *Bible Christianity*, they do not realise the fundamental idea of Protestantism, and their boast is not well founded.

This may suffice for the present. If the Editor of *Plain Words* please to vindicate the Protestantism of the State Church from the charge here made, he shall have our respectful attention, and, upon forwarding his strong reasons, be heard through our pages. This done we shall be ready to advance, and, taking his Irish Protestantism, show, that even as reformed by its severance from the State, it is inconsistent with the avowed principles of Protestantism.

THE CENSUS.—HOW SHALL THE CHURCH BE DESIGNATED?

THIS subject is now under the consideration of a Committee selected at the last Annual Meeting, prior to discussion in the approaching

Meeting at Newcastle. In the *Harbinger* for last February, page 57, a Brother has shown the mistakes and confusion which arise from the want

of uniformity in designation. On the same page brief remarks are given by the Editor, recommending the adoption of the name "*The Church of God*." Now, is this the name, above all others, for the Church? Certainly, in the whole scheme of redemption, precedence is given to the name of God the Father. This is affirmed in full view of, and faith in, the Godhead of our Lord Jesus. We must not then be understood as in any way diminishing the divine majesty and equality which the pen of inspiration gives to Him, "who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God," Phil. ii. 6; nor as in the least detracting from the grand fitness of His worthy and excellent name to designate "all the Churches of the saints." They were indeed called "*The Churches of Christ*," Rom. xvi. 16; His disciples, too, were called *Christians*, Acts xi. 26, 1 Peter iv. 16. No doubt this was the name which "rich men" blasphemed before the judgment seats: "Do not they blaspheme that worthy name by the which ye are called."—James ii. 6, 7.

It will be admitted that the name by which all the Churches of Christ should be known, can only be determined by the New Testament. Now the leading name, numerically, given to the Church by the Holy Spirit is "*THE CHURCH OF GOD*." The Church and Churches are so designated *twelve* times—(see Acts xx. 28, 1 Cor. i. 2, x. 32, xi. 16, 22, xv. 9, 2 Cor. i. 1, Gal. i. 13, 1 Thess. ii. 14, 2 Thess. i. 4, 1 Tim. iii. 5, 16). It is truly noted that the Church of God is *not once* called the Church of Christ, and only once the "*Churches of Christ*." Yet there are many passages which show that the Church of God is our Lord's heritage, for example: "Upon this rock I will build *my Church*," Matt. xvi. 16; "For they are *thine*, and all *mine* are *thine*, and *thine* are *mine*," John xvii. 9, 10; see also verses 20-23,

"If ye be *Christ's*, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs," &c.; "*Ye are Christ's*," 1 Cor. iii. 23; "Christ as a son over *his own house*, whose house are we," Heb. iii. 6; "He is the head of the body, the church," Col. i. 18; "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church," Eph. iii. 23; "I have espoused you to one husband, that I might present you as a chaste virgin to Christ," 2 Cor. xi. 2; "That he might *present it to himself* a glorious Church," Eph. v. 27; see Rev. xix. 6-9, xxi. 9. From these texts we may fairly conclude it highly proper to call the Church "*The Church of Christ*." But still it remains a fact that, while the Church is not once directly so designated, she is *nine* times called "*The Church of God*," and while Churches are only once called "*The Churches of Christ*," they are *three* times called "*The Churches of God*." Thus the leading name, numerically, was "*The Church of God*." Is there any reason why it should not be so now?

The phrase "*The Church of God*" appears also as the *chief* name, when viewed in the light of that marked precedence which is everywhere, in so many ways, revealed of God the Father. The following are samples: "I have manifested thy name unto the men which *thou gavest* me out of the world; *thine* they were, and *thou gavest* them me." Then *after* they were given, our Lord still says "For they are *thine*," John xvii. 6-9; compare verse 24; Heb. ii. 13; "I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God," 1 Cor. xi. 3; "All are your's; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's," 1 Cor. iii. 22, 23; " . . . The God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, . . . gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is the fulness of him that filleth all in all," Eph. i. 17-23; "Wherefore God

also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father," Phil. ii. 9-11; "But to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him: and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him," 1 Cor. viii. 6; "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, *who is above all, and through all, and in you all*," Eph. iv. 5, 6; "Baptizing them in (into) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (Spirit)," Matt. xxviii. 19; "For of him (God), and through him, and to him are all things; to whom be glory for ever. Amen," Rom. xi. 36. Thus precedence is given to the name of God in harmonious varieties. The name "THE CHURCH OF GOD" is therefore not only the name *most often* given to the Church, but it is *the highest* and loftiest that can be given; it is above all, and includes all divine majesty, glory, and power! Is there, then, any revelation, truth, or reason why the Churches of Christ should not *now* use "THE CHURCH OF GOD" as their *most frequent* and *primary* designation? Is it not *the name* which is above all?

If the Churches of Christ in this kingdom will return, in the census, as their church appellation the name "The Church of God," and use it as their leading title in all documents, books, papers, &c., *will it not prove the highest incentive to godly fear and reverence?* It seems clear that it had the highest purifying influence upon the Church at the first, and gave the greatest weight to apostolic teaching: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for

the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17.—"Or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have not." xi. 22. "For I am the least of the Apostles, that am not meet to be called an Apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God." xv. 9. "That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." 1 Tim. iii. 15. To be called after a name as ancient, and as lasting as eternity!—infinite in holiness, wisdom, glory and might, as revealed in and by His only Son, in creation, providence and redemption! The very thought of it has struck my own mind, and as many as I have mentioned it to, with reverential awe and with deepest feeling of unworthiness. The only demur I have heard against taking upon us a name so lofty, was simply a feeling of unworthiness—a feeling of fear and trembling! The voice from the burning bush takes hold of the heart with solemn force! "Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." Yes, it is "the household of God," "the house of God which is the Church of the living God," therefore "Be ye holy; for I am holy." But the fact that it inspires such a high moral sensitiveness is itself a grand reason in favour of its adoption. Such a lively and keen sense of unworthiness and fear, will greatly deepen our interest and faith in the great sacrifice and mediatorial work of His dear Son, and so help us to share more fully in His preservation of us in His Father's name.

The name we require for the next census return is a congregational, or church name. The names disciples, saints, brethren, and christians, not one of these denote a church, nor the church, but are simply descriptive of individuals, or members of the house of God and of Christ.

The choice then seems to rest, not between any of these, but between "The Church of God," "The Churches of God;" and "The Church of Christ," "The Churches of Christ." All these no doubt might be properly used interchangeably in a general way, but the former appears, according to New Testament usage, the most frequent and prominent; and should it not on that account be the name by which all the Churches of Christ should make themselves known to all England in the next census?

These brief hints are submitted to the consideration of the Churches,

with the hope of awakening a lively and careful inquiry into this very important, weighty subject; trusting also that it will move each Church to express deliberate judgment at our next annual meeting. This, coupled with what the committee appointed for its consideration may have to say thereon, will greatly help the meeting to come to one mind and action. Now, "unto Him (God) be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end. Amen."—Eph. iii. 21. F. EVANS.

Derby.

UNITARIANISM AN OUTPOST OF INFIDELITY.

April 28, 1870.

DEAR SIR,—My delay in answering your friendly remarks may, I fear, be interpreted into a resignation of the field. But it is not so, but purely from want of opportunity, and the pressure of woman's cares and duties.

It is true that some Unitarians speak and act as if they wished to leave Christianity in the background; and very sorry I am that it is the case. But that is no reason why you should condemn a whole community, amongst whom are to be found, and have been found, many of the grandest minds and purest souls in the world.

What is meant by Unitarianism? It means a belief in the strict personal unity of God, in opposition to that of a triune Deity. And in this belief truly there are others than Christians, as for instance, Jews and Mahometans. And thus the said Mahometans and Jews have placed their feet on the foundation and purest principle of all religion; for in Him, the one, true, and only God, "we live, and move, and have our being."

Why a belief in the first principle of all religion should be called an "out-post of infidelity," I know not. The only reason you state is, that many who are *not* Christian hold it. But will you consent to raze the firm foundation of a palace because hundreds of persons *not* of royal blood have found shelter within its walls? Because misers have hidden gold and made it useless, and spendthrifts have wasted it, and thousands of others have misappropriated it, will you therefore become an anchorite, and abandon it altogether? Unitarianism is a main and open principle to be embraced by all. The errors, or supposed errors, of

ministers and others are individual, each person who promotes them being alone responsible. If ever there was a purely unsectarian belief, it is that of the undivided unity of the Divine Being, in contradistinction to all the phases of Trinitarianism. This, and this alone, is Unitarianism; therefore, to condemn and spurn such a grand principle as an out-post of infidelity is wrong. Christianity itself might be condemned in like manner. You literally call good Mr. Hopps an *infidel* and a *condemner of Christianity*; your grounds for so doing being a single sentence in one out of his many publications. Instead of attempting to vindicate him in my poor way, I will let him vindicate himself, by transcribing a sentence or two from the April number of his magazine, *The Truth Seeker*. The essay, a sentence or two of which I copy, is on National Education, and in it the writer plainly states his own views—

"A 'Godless Education' would be an education without a God, and an 'Infidel Education' would be an education which denied and repudiated God. I call upon all fair and candid men to mark in every possible way their sense of the enormity of the offence against truth and charity, committed by those who use these phrases. We are *not* proposing to educate without religion and without God, we are not even proposing to educate without doctrines and the Bible: *for we teach our own children doctrines and the Bible.*"

If Mr. Hopps is more broad in his views than some Christian Unitarians, there are others on whom you could not cast a shadow of the same imputation. For example: Mr. Spears, of Stamford Street Chapel, London; Mr. J. C. Means, London; Dr. Beard, of Altringham, late of Manchester, and many others. The number is not limited.

With this letter I enclose a little tract,

published by Mr. Hopps, "What do we, as Unitarian Christians, believe?"—which has been widely circulated, the perusal of which I beg earnestly to recommend to your readers.

I am, dear Sir, yours truly,

ELIZA HADDOCK.

REMARKS.

Nothing do we more desire than the cultivation of *true* Christian charity, so as to allow the widest difference in opinion which Christianity will admit—that is, to extend the name Christian to all to whom the Scriptures will permit its application. Notwithstanding our desire in this direction is very strong, we can say nothing better of Unitarianism than that it is an *Out-post of Infidelity*. Nor does our correspondent at all aid us in getting to a more agreeable conclusion. She declares that "some Unitarians speak and act as though they wished to leave Christianity in the background." She might also have said that this sort includes a very large number, and, that though protested against by individuals, they are recognized by the bulk of Unitarians as belonging to them, and as entitled to the name of Christ. Then we are told that Unitarianism *includes* many who have not a belief in Christ, and who, indeed, hate Him, and and revile His name. Jews and Mahometans are thus named. We might then renounce our faith in Christ, and become a Jew; or give up the Bible, and become a follower of Mahomet; or reject both Jesus and Moses, and adopt as our Bible, Paine's *Age of Reason*—yea, become exactly what the infidel Paine was, and then we should be Unitarian. In a word, Unitarianism covers anything and everything short of absolute ATHEISM. Accordingly, Mr. Hopps is quoted as saying, "An Infidel Education would be an education which denied and repudiated God." So that, according to this "good Mr. Hopps," (whom, as our correspondent correctly intimates, we rank with infidels,) an education

in which pure Deism is the leading element, and Paine's *Age of Reason* the chief class-book, is *not* infidel!

The infidelity of those Unitarians of the class to which Mr. Hopps belongs is worse, by far, than that of Paine and Holyoake, because it is super-saturated with hypocrisy. We cannot esteem a man *because* he rejects Christianity, but we can and do respect men on account of their honesty who, having come to believe Christianity untrue, openly avow their unbelief. But this adhering to the *name* while you reject the *doctrine* is mean and contemptible in the extreme. In saying this we have the countenance of the better sort of Unitarians, who protest against such men as Mr. Hopps—yea, against himself. The very tract, enclosed by our correspondent—"What do we, as Unitarian Christians, believe?"—has brought upon its author (J. P. Hopps) the hot rebuke of high-minded Unitarians. As a sample we cite Mr. Bache, to the Editors of the *Unitarian Herald*. He says, "If your readers can accept such *word-juggling* as that which is presented in the communication from J. P. Hopps, nothing that I or any man can say will be of the least avail towards the discovery or the maintenance of truth." "Because I could not shut my eyes against similar word-juggling in the pamphlet published by this same writer some months ago, entitled '*What do Unitarian Christians believe?*' I have not encouraged the distribution of any copies of it, but have always, when opportunity has presented, entered my protest against it. It is this very *word-juggling* that I am resisting. In connection with any merely *secular* interests such *word-juggling* would not be tolerated for a moment. I, therefore, cannot and will not sanction it in connection with the far higher and more momentous interests of Christian truth and freedom." But, though thus denounced by the better Unitarians, this

pamphlet has been circulated to the extent of *two hundred and sixty thousand* copies, thus showing the willingness of Unitarians to support the juggler, and, by deceitful words, cheat the unwary.

But our correspondent intimates, that if Mr. Hopps is rather broad, there are others upon whom we cannot cast a shadow of a like imputation. Dr. Beard is named among her samples of completely satisfactory Unitarians. But we cannot accept any of them as thus satisfactory. So long as those better men please to connect themselves with a body so heterogeneous as that which includes Mr. Hopps, they must take the consequences arising from the connection. We cannot look at them apart from the body of which they form part. And could we do so, even then our phrase, which has called forth this correspondence, would not prove entirely inapplicable. Dr. Beard, with W. Gaskell, M.A., and J. Wright, B.A., have been known as Editors of the *Unitarian Herald*. From a leading article of that periodical we have the following:—"It is only self-deception to keep saying *we believe in the Bible*, when, in reality, it is only *some parts* of that book we value or reverence. It will

be a great gain to true religion when it becomes generally acknowledged that *ALL the Bible is the work of men*; that each part of it stands on its own merits, independent of the rest; and that the greatest love of its better portions is thoroughly consistent with neglect of those parts which can teach us nothing; and with *abhorrence* of its records of disgusting sins, and its exhibition of evil passions and unchristian tempers." We are not aware that Mr. Holyoake desires to say more against the Bible than is here said. The camp in which this much is taught is certainly, to say the least, an "Out-post of Infidelity."

The foregoing must suffice. This notice of Mr. Hopps has not been sought by us—we have been pushed into it by our persistent correspondent; but we cannot further indulge our friend. If Mr. Hopps himself wishes to be heard in defence, it is due that he be allowed to speak in our pages, which he can do by inserting the foregoing in his "*Truth Seeker*," with such reply of reasonable length as he may desire to publish; which shall be reprinted here if forwarded for that purpose.

Ed.

IN WHOM SHALL WE TRUST.

It is not the influence that a man brings into the Church from without that avails, but the influence he acquires within the Church. Moral power is not in the world, to be transferred into the Church; but springs up in the heart of the Church, and goes forth to sanctify and save. We come into the body of Christ, not to build it up, but to be built up; not to give power, but to get. Whenever a Church looks for strength from without, it is like Israel looking to Egypt in the day of its calamity. "Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help; and stay on horses,

and trust in chariots because they are many; and in horsemen because they are very strong; but they look not to the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord." The Jews always suffered when they looked to Egypt. Strength was not to be found there. They could furnish men, and horses, and chariots without number. But help for them was not in Egypt; not in numbers, even of their own, but in the Holy One of Israel. They were always "rebellious" when they sought help from without. God was the help of the nation, and it

mattered not whether by many or few, help was at hand, when they looked for it from Him.

Let us beware how we turn away from Him who is the help of His people, to those who are no help. The Lord is with you while ye be with Him; and if ye seek Him, He will be found of you: but if ye forsake Him, He will forsake you." As long as Asa, Jehosaphat, and other kings of Judah, relied on God in their trouble, they prospered; but as soon as they looked to the king of Syria, or made a league with Ahab, king of Israel, they were forsaken of God. They acted "foolishly," and from "thenceforth had wars."

I would recommend to all my readers, young and old, to read and study well the lessons found in the books of Samuel and of Kings. It will repay you to refresh your memories with them. They afford the most encouraging facts, as illustrative of the necessity and power of faith in the living God. They show that in the darkest day there may be light; and when all human help fails, God is at hand.

It was a dark hour for Israel, under Saul, when the people hid themselves "in caves and in thickets, and in rocks, and in high places, and in pits." Samuel was absent from Saul, and the foolish king took upon himself to do only what Samuel was authorized to do—to offer a burnt offering and peace offerings. Saul "forced himself" to do it. The Philistines had so effectually conquered and enslaved Israel that "no smith was found in the land." If they wanted to sharpen "a share, or coulter, or ax, or mattock," they had to go down to the Philistines. It was a humiliating state of things this, and it is just what the Church now is subjected to, when it turns away from God. The Philistines are upon the "scattered" people. They have neither sword nor spear. All that Saul could gather together

was six hundred men, and the Philistines were strong and numerous. But Jonathan, the son of Saul, said to the young man, his armour-bearer: "Come and let us go over to the garrison of these uncircumcised; it may be that the Lord will work for us; for there is no restraint to the Lord to save by many or by few." The result was a glorious victory. The garrison of the Philistines was taken; an immense slaughter ensued; they fell upon each other: the host trembled; and the earth quaked. It was a very great trembling from God." It looked like a very rash undertaking for Jonathan. Well it was, looking on the human side of the matter; but with God and Jonathan it was one of the most reasonable undertakings in the world. We should not look on men as the political economist does in reference to the power of numbers—so many men—so much work. We should look at each individual man, and calculate what he is worth with God on his side. It is the "sword of the Lord and Joshua" that prevails. All the instances recorded in the Epistle to the Hebrews of the mighty works done by God's ancient people, are due to "faith contending with difficulties." Faith in God is not only the lever by which we can remove mountains, but the balance in which he weighs men, and puts them to the proof. All the historical books of the Old Testament teach these lessons, and therefore, are profitable for doctrine and for instruction in righteousness.

In looking at our own history. I think it will appear that only as we have relied on God and His word, have we prospered. We were compelled to do this for many years. Egypt could give us no help. We formed no covenant with it. Doubtless, some thought that her men, and horses, and chariots might help us; but the great body of our people looked to the living God. At times

the Philistines have been upon us, and they are always at our doors. But when we think of Safety or deliverance in ourselves or in an arm of flesh, we shall fail. It seems strange that no warnings or examples to the Israelites could convince them of the danger of trusting in themselves or others in time of danger: and it is too much the case with Christians now. Any attempt on our part to wait on God for vain show, or to save appearances, or simply to quiet our consciences, is the height of folly.

We don't expect miracles now. But God is still with His people, and he can work either with "many or few." But a Jonathan and his faithful armour-bearer may throw confusion and distrust into the garrison of the Philistines, and put into motion a system of things

that shall result gloriously in favour of the truth as it is in Jesus.

We need a deeper sense of our own insufficiency, and a stronger and more simple confidence in a living Saviour. We need to break down the images and the groves, and to return to the "old paths," and walk therein. We have prospered mightily as a people, and shall continue to prosper just so long as we "preach the word," and live it. When we get tired of that, and the people get tired of it, our strength is gone. But we must progress in the way of righteousness. The life of our early history will not suffice for its present stage. We should be stronger in the faith, and more steadfast and enduring than at any period of the past.

JAMES CHALLEN.

YOUR CONSCIENCE AND MINE.

OUR attention has been called to the necessity of some guiding principle by which to satisfactorily dispose of the many cases, continually arising, which are usually referred to the arbitrament of conscience. Philosophical writers do not agree on the nature or the function of conscience; much less is there agreement among the masses of the people. The Bible does not define the term; it is simply used, as other words are, in its current sense, leaving us to gather the meaning from the connection and from grammars and dictionaries.

Without attempting here to determine the nature of conscience, I proceed to inquire into what it does not do, what it does do, and the limit of its exercise.

1. Conscience does not determine the truth of things. This is the province of other faculties of the mind. The facts and circumstances bearing on a given question being brought together, the judgment compares them and renders a de-

cision. The decision may be wrong, but, if so, it is an error of the judgment, and not of the conscience. We would not expect to ascertain the facts of history, determine the truths of science or prove mathematical propositions by an exercise of conscience.

It is but an application of this position to say that conscience does not determine the *right* of things. Truth on moral and religious questions is ascertained in the same way and by the same faculties of mind that it is on scientific questions. "What is right," is practically but another form of inquiring "What is truth? And it is useless to attempt to settle either question by an appeal to conscience. Just here I will state the more general negative proposition: Conscience has nothing to do with abstract, or theoretical truth merely, whether religious, moral or scientific, nor with any mental operation as such. Hence a person might argue on both sides of a

proposition, for the sake of argument, without being held guilty of any moral wrong.

2.—Conscience concerns itself with what we do, with our overt acts, and with such of these only, as are right or wrong in a moral sense. When anything is proposed to be done, two questions arise: 1. Is it right? 2. Shall I do it? The intellect answers the first—conscience answers the second. Conscience is that faculty, or something within us, that urges us to do what we believe to be right, and restrains us from doing what we believe to be wrong. When we heed its entreaties, we have an inward delight which we attribute to an approving conscience; when we disregard its promptings, we experience a remorse of conscience, we feel condemned. Pilate's wife acted the part of conscience when she said: "Have thou nothing to do with that just man."

Each individual conscience is exercised only in reference to the acts of the individual. This is its sphere. Beyond this it cannot go. My conscience cannot sit in judgment on your action, nor can your conscience approve or condemn me for my action. "Why is my liberty judged by another's conscience?" My conscience impels me to do what my judgment tells me is right; but it does not therefore impel you to do the same thing. Your conscience impels you to do what you think is right; but you cannot thence impose upon me the same obligation. If my judgment errs, it is proper for you to teach me. If we agree in judgment, your conscience incites you to do the same thing which my conscience urges upon me. I never think it a sufficient reason to deter a man from doing a thing to say, "I am conscientiously opposed to it." This is a reason why I should not do it, but no reason for you. True, Paul teaches you to have regard for my conscience, and for my ignorance; if I am weak and liable to stumble

and fall, and be lost on account of something which you may do, though perfectly right in itself, yet, I being ignorant, do not understand it, and would likely pervert it. Certainly I should feel it my duty to have respect for your conscience, if by disregarding it, I should be the occasion of your being lost. But I have never yet had to ask any one to thus act on account of my conscience, and I hope and pray that, weak as I am, my weakness will never become so great as to render it necessary.

There might be little or no difficulty in applying these principles to those cases requiring individual action simply; but when we come to act in a congregational capacity there is greater complexity. If, however, we remember that congregations are composed of individuals and that whatever is done by the congregation must be done by its members, we will perceive that each conscience must act as though it stood alone, and hence must be governed by the same general principles.

Should the majority of a Church decide to do something that I thought was wrong, my conscience would deter me from doing it; but I could not prevent those who thought it was right. I might say I believed they were doing wrong; but they could say in reply that they believed they were doing right. The conscience of the minority cannot be exercised over the the majority, nor can that of the majority be extended to the minority. Each has its own proper sphere of action.

Cases not unfrequently arise in which there is no moral principle involved in the thing to be done, the obligation to do, or not to do, depending on the voice of the people. In such cases my conscience tells me to submit to the decision of the majority. Such it seems to me should be the decision of every conscience in like circumstances.

The word of God teaches us "that there should be no schism in the

body." Having decided to be governed by the word of God, I cannot conscientiously have anything to do in making or perpetuating schism. Granting that the church may do something that does not seem to me to accord with the word, I am not justified in making it the occasion of schism, a thing not thus opposed to the word. The church doing one thing wrong does not justify me in doing another. In my judgment a schism is never justifiable unless the body from which you have separated has itself so far departed from the word that it can no longer be scripturally

considered a church. It is then an apostasy. It is then our duty to "come out of her." But let us neither acknowledge it, nor denominate it a church. As long as a church is governed exclusively by the Bible, embracing nothing in its organism which supports or subverts Bible teaching, imposing nothing on me contrary to my conscience, restricting me in nothing that my conscience enjoys, so long am I willing to work with that church to advance the Master's cause.

W. W. HAYDEN.

BIBLE TRANSLATION REVISION.

THE common English version of the Bible is to undergo speedy revision. Both Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury have resolved that it shall be done. The Bishops and Clergy thus committed to the work have wisely determined that there shall be no alteration in the old version merely for the sake of change; that it shall be amended only where necessary fairly to express the idea of the original. The text to that extent is to be improved, and marginal readings admitted. The work is not confined to members of the State Church. Not only are Nonconformists eligible, but English-speaking scholars, without regard to their professing Christianity at all, are declared competent. This is as it should be. Why exclude a learned Hebrew because his faith extends

not beyond Moses? Scholarship, not theology, is wanted, and the Bishops have done themselves honor by thus throwing open the door.

The hireling priests of infidelity are already crying out upon the subject. They hate Bible revision as they hate light in general. They know that half their attacks upon the Bible rest upon errors in the translation, and that their stock-in-trade will be much reduced. We, however, rejoice, because we know that every approach to a correct rendering of the whole Bible gives power to the Church and to the truth, and tends to put infidelity out of court, and pave the way for the return of believers generally to Christian union and the primitive order of things.

ED.

PAUL AT MARS' HILL.

A STRONG indirect argument for the authenticity of the Scriptures is found in their perfectly truthful descriptions of the scenery, the people, and the customs of the places of which they treat. The traveller in the Holy Land finds the Bible the best of guide books. Professor Felton, in his "Familiar Letters," gives the following account of his visit

to Mars' Hill, the scene of one of Paul's finest sermons:—

"I read the admirable discourse of St. Paul, standing, as he did, in the midst of Mars' Hill. I read it five times from beginning to end—twice aloud, in the presence of the same natural features of the scene that lay before his eyes, and many of the grandest objects of art that he

saw, ruined but still sublime. The discourse in the Acts is evidently only a sketch of the sermon as it was delivered, but I think it embraces all the main points. Standing there, on an elevated rock, in the midst of Mars' Hill, silent, with the Acropolis before me, covered with fragments of idols and ruins of 'temples made with hands,' the seat of the Areopagites around me scarcely traceable, and crumbling with age and weather, and no one to fill them, except the fancied forms of the Epicureans and Stoics who encountered St. Paul. I could well understand the noble eloquence with which the Apostle spoke to his curious hearers of the 'God that made the world and all things therein,' who is 'Lord of heaven and earth, and dwelleth not in temples made with hands.'

These words are even more striking now than when St. Paul uttered them. Then these glorious temples stood entire, and the statues that peopled and surrounded them seemed like an assembly of gods; now the gods are prostrate, or carried away to adorn the museums of distant lands. Heads, arms, legs, mutilated bodies—majestic, beautiful indeed, but thrown down from their high places, and broken in pieces, or laboriously put together by the antiquary, are all that remain around

the ruinous and time-stained columns which stand so mournfully on the spot which they once made the central point of Grecian worship. Surely the Apostle's words sound more solemn after eighteen centuries have wrought so tremendous an argument for their truth. If any temples built by human hands deserved to be the dwelling place of God, it was the temples on the Acropolis; and what are they now! Wonderfully do those old columns, friezes, and architraves stand out against an Attic evening sky; wonderfully do they reflect the rays of the sun, as he comes up in his morning splendour over the ridges of Hymettus. But God is in the setting and rising sun; He is enthroned in the blue arch of the sky; He looks down from yonder crescent moon that hangs over the Acropolis; His breath is the soft air which sweeps over these beautiful mountains and these spreading plains; but surely He dwelleth not in the mouldering temples made by human hands, however cunning. St. Paul, having so powerfully declared this truth, passes on with admirable tact and brief but effective eloquence, to the brotherhood of men and the future judgment of the world by the Saviour; and closes most impressively with the resurrection of the dead."

REPINING AND REPENTING.

"The foolishness of man perverteth his way, and his heart fretteth against the Lord."
—Pro. xix. 3.

"If any say I have sinned and perverted that which is right, and it profiteth me not, He is gracious unto him."—Job. xxxiii. 27.

MURMURING and mourning are here set forth. How much does God say, in his word, against the one—how much in commendation of the other? Yet man is prone to the former and backward to the latter. It is natural to fallen man to murmur against God's actions. It is a spiritual act rightly to mourn over our own misdoings. If we read

the histories of God's book we find none were more severely punished than the murmurers. God still whispers, "Neither murmur ye;" and many threatenings hang over the heads of those who do so. He who was so emphatically "a man of sorrows," whose heart never held a murmuring thought, and from whose tongue the hasty word never dropped,

says, "Blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted." God looks down complacently and compassionately on mourning souls, and says of each, as of Ephraim, "I have surely heard him bemoaning himself." "I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the Lord." Those who murmur most against God have themselves to blame, they have "perverted their own way." Those who see this and mourn over the same, do so because they look at their own way in the light of God's

law, and in the light of his love. They look on Him whom they have pierced and mourn. Blessed mourning which attracts God's notice and is followed by his consolations! Let us watch against the tendency to murmur, and cherish those thoughts which produce contrition without despondency. The first is like the blighting east wind, the second like the warm southern breeze, which is followed by the fruit-producing shower.

J. C.

ITEMS OF NEWS.

BERWICK, VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA, FEB. 28, 1870.—DEAR BR. KING,—Since my arrival in Victoria I have not sent you an "Item of News," but now I take up my pen to do so. In reference to Pahrnan and Richmond other brethren have written, and no doubt will write. What I have now to say is in reference to the cause in Berwick, which as yet you will not have heard of. Berwick is a town twenty-five miles from Pahrnan and eleven miles from the church in Pakenham. Having promised to the brethren at Pakenham to visit Berwick where I had hope of doing much good, I commenced on Dec. 7, and continued over three Lord's days there. Bills having been distributed through the country announcing discourses in the Temperance Hall I expected good meetings, but was disappointed, only five or six attended the first. The second was no better. Besides, everywhere I heard of misrepresentation. It seems that some who knew of the cause at Pakenham were afraid of the result at Berwick, and, therefore, did their best to bias the minds of the people. The circumstances were so unfavourable that I felt I should be justified in leaving without further attempt. However, I concluded that as it seemed to be a place where sectarianism and infidelity reigned, there the servant of God ought to be, to stem the corruption. I, therefore, visited every day, and reasoned with all classes I met, in-doors and on the street—Infidels, Roman Catholics, Episcopopians, &c., pleading the claims of the Son of God. A reaction took place, and I closed with ten men and five women confessing the Messiahship of Jesus and being baptized. I left them remaining steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, in the fellowship, the breaking of bread, and the prayers. Four weeks after this I made another visit of two days when seven more decided, two of

whom were then baptized. The others I left to be baptized, a day or two afterwards, by a Br. Edward Weekins, who on behalf of the Church in Berwick and Pakenham, I had arranged with to labour among them as an Evangelist. He is a Brother of promise who came to us some time ago in Richmond, to correct us in our teaching, and who thereby gave us the opportunity of "instructing him in the way of the Lord more perfectly." Since he has been in Berwick he has baptized eleven, thus increasing the number to twenty-eight, whose zeal and faithfulness are commendable. I still look for good increase to the cause there. Had I left it at the first, when there seemed hardly any possibility of doing good, it would have been difficult to plant the cause there afterwards. This hurried sketch shows the *power* of God's truth under adverse circumstances, and ought to help and encourage us "not to weary in well doing." May the Lord bless the young Church and the Brother labouring among them, that they may mightily increase.

By the reports which you receive from time to time from the Australian Colonies, you will see that converts are much more easily brought to the truth here than in England, the *circumstances are so different*. May the Lord keep us faithful, that at the last we may exclaim, "I have kept the faith."—In all affection, yours in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ,

J. A. HAMILL.

BEDLINGTON, MAY 10, 1870.—Having been requested to give some account of the visit of Br. Evans to us, it is with pleasure that I state that eight persons have been added to the church by confession and baptism; three of whom were from the neighbouring town of Blyth, and formerly belonged to the Methodists. There are many more dissatisfied with their present

position and seeking for more light. There seems to be a harvest ready to be gathered in, were there only a qualified reaper; but as in the days of the Saviour, even so now, "the labourers are few." Could some one be spared for a little time to labour there much good might be done. Had Br. Evans not been called away by family affliction we have no doubt but by this time a church would have been gathered in Blyth. Trusting that this important town may be brought more fully under the attention of the surrounding churches, and that something special may be done by the coming annual meeting of the brethren, I conclude by subscribing myself, yours sincerely,

S. BRIGGS.

SHEFFIELD.—DEAR BR. KING,—I write to say that a few brethren continue to meet at 44, Milton Street, to break bread in remembrance of our Lord Jesus. We shall be glad for any one that may come our way to meet with us.

T. FREEMAN.

LEICESTER.—During the last month the Church in Leicester has had two short visits from Br. King. Interesting confessions of the faith have resulted from the public services and much private converse. The church has also been edified, and advanced somewhat in organization.—During the second visit, after a discourse, and subsequent instruction upon the qualifications, work, election and ordination of deacons, the church with almost perfect unanimity elected five brethren, whom Br. King afterwards ordained by the laying on of hands and prayer. An addition was also made to the provisional overseers, and arrangements are in progress for regular and systematic visitation of absent members.

CHELSEA.—During the past three months the church here has been greatly refreshed by the presence of our esteemed and highly valued Br. McDougall, whose able minis-

trations have contributed to the general welfare of the church in a marked degree. His efforts in works of all kinds have been greatly blessed and most abundant, though frequently prosecuted while suffering much physical weakness. The members generally have been quickened to greater love and activity, and though only three have yielded obedience to the Lord we have every reason to believe that much more good has been done than is at present manifest. It would be wrong in every case to estimate services rendered by the immediate results. Let us rather wait the Lord's time patiently for the ripening days after the diligent sowing of the seed. But it is not too much to say that Br. McDougall's manifold works for the church, and his devoted and ever-loving manner and life have left their mark here, which will never be effaced, and he has gone away amid unanimous feelings of regret. A farewell meeting was held at College Street Chapel on Thursday, May 5th, when a large number of brethren were present, and several also from Camden Town. The most fervent words of esteem and admiration were poured forth by all, coupled with the earnestly-expressed desire for his speedy return.

S. B.

Obituary.

HUMPHREY HARTSHORN fell asleep in Jesus, January 24, 1870, in his 81st year, member of the church at Langley. After losing his sight, he was gladly led six miles on the Lord's day to be present at the table of the Lord.

J. M.

SARAH WARHURST departed this life, April 8, 1870, aged 83 years. She has been a consistent Christian fifty-nine years, and united with the church in Ashton about eighteen years ago. She died in full hope of eternal life.

C. E.

The Family Room.

PREVAILING PRAYER.

THERE is a mystery in prayer. How moves it the mind of God! Is He not above all persuasive appeals from mortals? How can the petitions of man change His purpose or action? It is strange that prayer should avail. Can weakness influence omnipotence? Can folly change the course of infinite wisdom? Can sinners attract the attention of the Holy God? Of what use then is prayer?

Some say that prayer is a mere pious exercise of our hearts, and that it is bigotry, delusion, to suppose that the prayers of the church can influence Jehovah. But who can pray with such a belief? Pray for exercise! Pray as a pious gymnastic! We should laugh ourselves in the face, at every attempt to pray thus. Ask, beseech, implore God for blessings, just for exercise! We should blush to the very centre of

our souls, to think of such a thing? our lips would scorn to utter words were prayers such a mockery.

Some talk of law, of the laws which govern God, of a certain order of action to which he is bound, and aver that prayer can change no results, that the same thing will occur whether we pray or not. But is law God's master or His servant? Does God give the same blessings to those who do not, as to those who do pray? Is God the active Governor of the world, or the passive slave of what men call "nature?" Is He above law, or its vassal? The Bible and nature assures us that God superintends the world's affairs; and reason suggests that He will treat the praying man as prayerless men are never treated.

When the Bible speaks of "prevailing prayer," of the prayer of faith, of the effectual prayer of the righteous; of God as a prayer hearer, it either deceives and confounds the reader, or it assures us that prayer does prevail, and that specific answers come from God. The spirit and language of the Bible uniformly represent God as giving personal

attention to the acts, the character and wants of men; as especially attentive to the interests of those who obey Him. There is none of this cold philosophy, none of this binding of Jehovah by laws of fate; no separating man from his Maker; no mere machine, no impersonal relation between them is set forth in the Bible; but a personal attention, active solicitude for man's good, and a general response to his prayers, is everywhere predicated of the Lord.

Experience corroborates what the Bible affirms. The saints have been receiving special answers to prayer. Omitting the Scriptural examples, we have conclusive evidence of this in the current history of the church. Every devoted Christian can relate facts in his own experience which prove this. We must have met this fact everywhere in our intercourse with the saints.

Prayer is not in vain. If the church wants great prosperity, let them pray, pray earnestly, fervently, importunately, in faith in Jesus' name, and the blessings will come.

Morning Star.

"NO WORD FOR JESUS."

I have often thought of a little incident told me by a friend of mine; a young lady, who was a devoted Christian. We were speaking upon the duty of Christians conversing with their impenitent friends. Maggie D. said, "I should not feel that I had done my duty, if there was one friend with whom I had not conversed on the subject of religion. I cannot tell their thoughts; they may, while appearing indifferent, be most anxious for me to direct them to the Saviour. If they should die without a change of heart, how sad would be the thought that I had uttered no word of warning, or made no effort to save them."

"All have not the talent for speaking that you have; it would

be extremely difficult, almost impossible, for some," I replied.

"I once thought as you do," she said, "but I think if we make the effort God will assist us. My brother Henry, who is a pastor in a large and flourishing church, always urges this duty. Wherever he is, he never omits to say a word for Jesus.—I was visiting there one time, when Richard, his little boy, stopped suddenly in his play, and looked steadily at me for a minute. 'What are you thinking about?' I asked. 'If you are a Christian, Auntie, are you?' 'I hope so dear.' 'But you never speak of Jesus. If you loved Him very much, would you not talk about Him sometimes?' 'We may love a person without speaking of

him,' I replied. 'May we? I did not know that. You love to talk of your brothers and sisters, and your papa and your mama, don't you, Auntie?' 'Yes.' 'And then you speak of other people and things you like, but you speak no word for Jesus. Don't you love Him, Auntie?' 'Yes dear.' Then I should think you could not help speaking of Him sometimes.'

"This conversation with Richard made a strong impression upon my mind. We mingle in society and converse upon every topic of the day, but speak no word for Jesus. From my own experience, I judge it is not so much timidity or a sense

of unworthiness which keeps us silent, as want of love. 'Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.' If our hearts were filled with love to our Saviour, would our lips be silent?"

"Is it through fear of giving offence that we speak no word for Jesus? We do not know who may be expecting or longing for us to speak of Jesus. We cannot tell what power our words may have. One day we shall know. And if we are faithful we may find many souls won, to shine as stars in our crown of rejoicing, who might have been lost if we had spoken no word for Jesus.

BEGINNING AT ONCE.

"Wait not for more light."

FAITH is the starting-post of obedience, but what I want is, that you start immediately, that you wait not for more light to spiritualize your obedience but that you work for more light by yielding a present obedience up to the present light which you profess, that you stir up all the gift which is now in you, and this is the way to have the gift enlarged, that, whatever your hand findeth to do in the way of service to God, you now do it with all your might. And the very fruit of doing

it because of His authority, is that you will at length do it because of your own renovated taste. As you persevere in the labors of His service you will grow in the likeness of His character. The graces of holiness will both brighten and multiply upon you. These will be your treasures, and treasures for heaven, too—the delights of which mainly consist in the affections and feelings, and congenial employments of the new creature.—DR. CHALMERS.

NEARER HEAVEN.

THE simple fact of our time getting shorter each day does not imply that we are getting also nearer heaven. As time is flying, it may carry us on its wings nearer hell than heaven. The true and only reliable rule by which to judge upon this point is, whether we are getting nearer holiness. If we are growing in conformity to the divine likeness and nature; if we are dying daily to sin and living unto God; if we are realizing more and more of the love of Christ within us; if we are rising higher in spirituality of affection and thought; if we are delighting ourselves more heartily in the service

of God, then we are, indeed, getting nearer heaven. Heaven is perfection in holiness, according to the will of God, and as we approach this we approach heaven.

Let us distinctly and vividly understand this. There is a danger lest we think too much of heaven as a place of beauty, of pleasure, of glory, of great society, without thinking of it as a place of spotless purity; and all those features of heaven as arising out of this. Let us, then, press on toward purity, through the blood of the Lamb; and in the proportion as we do this we shall get nearer heaven.

THE DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE AS TO THE RELATION OF BAPTISM AND THE REMISSION OF SINS.—No. II.

HAVING examined thus the passages which explicitly affirm relation between baptism and the remission of sins, and ascertained what they teach, and only can teach, by a *critical* examination of the meaning of the words in which they are expressed, we proceed next to consider other passages, in which this relation is also taught, but through different forms of expression. We may divide these, for convenience of discussion, into *two* classes. *First*, passages which affirm this relation directly by *parallel* terms or phrases; and, *second*, passages which teach it by *clear implication*.

Of the *first* kind are such as: 1. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark xvi, 16.) 2. "The Lord added to the Church daily the saved." (Acts ii, 47.) 3. "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." (Acts xxii, 16.) 4. "And such were some of you; but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." (1 Cor. vi, 11.) 5. "That He might sanctify and cleanse it (the Church) with the washing of water by the Word." (Eph. v, 26.) 6. "The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God), by (*dia*) the resurrection of Jesus Christ." (1 Peter iii, 21.)

In these passages the phrase, "the remission of sins," is *paralleled* by the phrases "be saved," "wash away thy sins," "were washed," "cleanse with the washing of water," and "baptism doth now save us," and they as clearly assert the relation between baptism and the remission of sins as do those passages upon which we have already commented. This, we think, cannot be denied unless it be assumed, first, that "save" and "cleanse" are not equivalent to "the remission of sins;" or, *second*, that the "washing" referred to does not express the effect of baptism. Neither of these positions can be successfully maintained.

The word "save" (σώζω), or "salvation" (σωτηρία), when used with reference to man's moral or spiritual standing before God, always, in the Scriptures, means the deliverance from the criminal and condemning consequences of sin. "He shall be called Jesus, because he shall save his people from their sins;" "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners;" "For the Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which is lost;" "The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth;" these, and similiar declarations, show that "the remission of sins," and "salvation," are but two expressions for the same thought. To remit one's sins is to take away judicially, the ground of condemnation; remove the cause of his ruin. To save one, is to deliver him from the consequences of sin; rescue him from ruin. The first expression looks to the cause; the second, to the effect. Both, as acts of divine mercy, result in pardon and restoration to favour. Pardon one's sins and you save him, for his sins alone destroy him; save a man and you pardon his sins, for salvation, in the divine economy, is only reached by the removal of one's sins. Hence it is said of John the Baptist: "Thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; to give knowledge of salvation unto his people 'in' (ἐν) the remission of their sins," (Luke i, 77;) and again, of the Saviour: "In whom we have redemption through his blood; the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace," etc. (Eph. i, 7; Col. i, 14.)

In the first of these passages a part of the force is lost in the transla-

tion of the common version. The comma after "people" should be omitted, and the preposition *ἐν* should be translated by "in," its proper meaning, so as to show that not "salvation" simply, but the *knowledge* of salvation (*γνῶσιν σωτηρίας*) is given in "the remission of sins." In the second quotation, the phrase "forgiveness or remission (*ἀφεσιν*) of sins," is introduced as explanatory of the word "redemption" (*ἀπολύτρωσιν*); but redemption, considered as an effect of the ransom paid for sin, is no less than "salvation," both depending alike upon the sacrifice of Christ, so that "forgiveness of sins" and "salvation," are, in the language of Scripture, equivalent ideas; and this is so, whether the "forgiveness" be considered in its *negative* or *positive* aspect, since "salvation" also may be equally considered in both ways. If, through the merits of Christ, *negatively*, men's trespasses are not imputed unto them, but they are persuaded, through a ministry of reconciliation *positively*, to appropriate the promise of the remission of sins, so it is equally true that *negatively* "God our Saviour will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all." So is He, *negatively*, "the Saviour of all men," but *positively*, only of *such as believe*, as by faith and obedience lay hold of the promise.

Having shown thus the parallelism of the expressions "the remission of sins," and "saved," or "salvation," we are warranted in concluding that whatever relation these passages affirm to exist between baptism and "salvation" exists also between baptism and "the remission of sins." This we assume to be logically indisputable.

In reference to the word "cleans," we need say but little. It occurs only once in the passages I have quoted, and there the reference is so plainly to "the remission of sins," that we presume it will be questioned by no one. "Cleansing," under the new dispensation, can have reference to nothing but sins. It is said, Christ, by his blood, purges the conscience from dead works." "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin." "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." *The Father cleanses us of sins by forgiving them.*

We said, *first*, that the words "save" and "cleans," in the several passages referred to in this part of our argument, are equivalent to the phrase "the remission of sins." This we have made good. We said, *second*, that the "washing" referred to in these passages expresses the effect of "baptism." We proceed to establish this. The exhortation of Ananias to Paul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins," (Acts xxii, 16,) admits of no ambiguity. It has successfully resisted the ingenuity of theological critics, whose systems of doctrine did not harmonize with its plain teachings. When Olshausen, with a nobility of scholarship which lifted him above petty efforts to strain the Scriptures to make them suit imaginary systems, declares that this passage "plainly represents baptism as an act of cleansing from sin," (the *ἀφεσίς τῶν αμαρτιῶν*—the remission of sins) his learned translator, Dr. Kendrick, adds, in a precautionary note, "the expression, however, is not to be *literally* interpreted. 'Wash away thy sins' in baptism is an elliptical and forcible expression, equivalent to 'submit to that baptism which attends upon and indicates the remission of sin.' Baptism without faith could certainly not bring salvation, and faith under circumstances where baptism is impossible, will be accepted of God." This is, indeed, a singular caveat. Who, in the present day, asserts any connection between

baptism without faith, and salvation? Why deny it? Or, who dogmatizes against the acceptableness of faith, where baptism is impossible? Why affirm it? The true question is as to the relation between a baptism *with* faith, and the remission of sins. Dr. Kendrick admits, as he must, that the passage means, *wash away thy sins in baptism*, but says it is equivalent to "submit yourself to that baptism which attends upon and indicates the remission of sin." And what baptism is this? He says: "The rite of baptism follows upon and symbolizes the forgiveness of sins." This is it then; but there is no such baptism spoken of in the New Testament. If Paul's baptism followed upon and symbolized the forgiveness of sins, how could Ananias, in the strong imperative of the middle voice, command him to "have himself baptized and cleansed of his sins"? Paul surely did not regard his sins as consciously *forgiven* before his baptism. On the contrary, he was in deep distress, and "did neither eat nor drink." True, "the expression is not to be *literally* interpreted;" that is to say, Paul's sins were not *material* pollution, clinging to the surface of his body, to be washed away by the solvent property of water; and this is all that should be meant by saying "the expression is not to be *literally* interpreted." The only figure in the case is in considering sins under the analogy of material pollution. The use of water in baptism is *literal*; the *consequent* of baptism, which is the remission of sins, is *literal*; the conception of this consequent under the relation which washing bears to material cleansing, this only is *figurative*, and the meaning is, that as in nature washing is the means of cleansing from material pollution, so by Divine appointment baptism is the means of cleansing from spiritual pollution. When, however, we speak of means in connection with spiritual effects, we must not confound the relation of the two in any literal sense with that which exists between physical means and physical effects.

The passage, "And such were some of you; but ye were washed," etc., (1 Cor. vi, 11,) is a clear allusion to baptism. The "such" refers to the sins mentioned in the 9th and 10th verses, and the middle voice of the verb *apelousasthe* (ἀπελούσασθε) is a declaration that they had *washed themselves clean as to them*. But the only way of being washed clean of sins, recognized in the Scriptures, is by baptism.* So in the next passage quoted: "That He might sanctify and cleanse *it* (the Church) with the washing of water by the Word." (Eph. v, 26.) What can the washing of water be but baptism? and what is the *cleansing* effected by it but the washing away of sins? which, as we have seen, is the act of God forgiving sins in baptism. "In the word," (ἐν ῥήματι) shows that the cleansing efficacy of baptism is in the power of the word. "If the power of the word be not felt in the heart, in true repentance and faith, the baptism is worthless—with this accompanying condition, it is a bath of cleansing whereby the *bride* is *purified* and made presentable to the bridegroom," "a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing."

The passage from 1 Peter iii, 21, is particularly instructive. When it is said, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us—not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God—by (δὲ) the resurrection of Jesus Christ," there is a clear recognition of baptism, as a cleansing ordinance. "Not the

* The passage in Rev. i, 5, does indeed represent Christ as having "washed us from our sins in his own blood," but the washing here is not *literal*, as in the passages under consideration, and the explanation is, of course, different.

putting away of the filth of the flesh" is an explanation that the effect of this baptism is not to be understood as removing material or outward pollution, as in the Jewish lustrations, and which is the ordinary material effect of washing the body, still, that it is nevertheless a cleansing, but of the inner man, the conscience. "The filth of the flesh" (*ῥύπον σαρκός*); is put in antithesis to "a good conscience" (*ἀγαθὴ συνείδησις*); the former is *not*, the latter *is*, the end of baptism. But in what sense can "baptism" be called "the answer of a good conscience"? We think there can be no critical doubt that "answer" is not the translation of the Greek word *eperotema* (*ἐπερωτημα*), which is used here. This word occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, but the verb *eperotao* (*ἐπερωτάω*), from which it is formed, occurs frequently, and it never means to "answer" but always "to ask." This, too, is the only classical meaning of both forms—of the verb and the verbal. Evidently the translators have taken an unwarranted license here, based upon some *imagined* allusion in the expression to the asking and answering of questions at the time of baptism. But these catechetical experiences were of a later date. This is fatal to the fancy; but even if it were not, we have no right to attach a totally new meaning to a word when its legitimate signification makes good sense, and, in fact, better sense than the one which is forced into service. Unquestionably we ought to read "asking," not "answer."

In what sense, then, can baptism be called "the asking of a good conscience toward (*eis*) God"? "Good conscience" is in the genitive, and this case expresses that with respect to which "the asking" must be understood, but whether in the "subjective" or "objective" sense must be determined by the connection. "The asking of a good conscience" may mean either an "asking" proceeding from "a good conscience" as the *subject*, or an "asking" having respect to "a good conscience" as its *object*, expressed by "for"; as when we say, "The love of God," we may mean either the love which God feels as the *subject*, or the love which is directed to God as the *object*, equal to "love *for* God." Grammatically, "a good conscience" in our passage may be either a *subjective* or an *objective* genitive; the connection must determine. If we say it is "a subjective genitive," then we make the "asking" proceed from a good conscience previously existing; it is a good conscience when it "asks." But "the asking" is the parallel of "baptism," and if the former proceed from a good conscience, so must the latter. But it is said, in the first member of the sentence, "Baptism doth now save us," and if "a good conscience" precedes baptism, so must it also precede that which is the effect of baptism; that is, we must have a good conscience before we are saved. This is absurd, and therefore we must reject the hypothesis that the adjunct "a good conscience" is a *subjective* genitive.

Not only does the harmony of the sense require us to do this, but the grammatical relation which the expressions "the filth of the flesh" and "a good conscience" bear to each other leads us to the same conclusion. The two expressions are both in the genitive case, and grammatically correspond to one another. But the former is clearly an *objective* genitive. The "putting away" is not an action proceeding from "the filth of the flesh" as the *subject*, but is an action done with respect to "the filth of the flesh" as its *object*. As this is an *objective* genitive, so, grammatically, must we understand its antithesis to be. What sense will this give to the expression, "The asking of a good conscience toward God"? Clearly this; that the "baptism which doth now save us is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the asking or seeking *for* a good conscience

toward (*eis*) or 'as regards' God." Thus the object of baptism is to be saved, and the object of its parallel, "the asking," is to procure a good conscience toward God, and both salvation and "a good conscience toward God" flow from "the remission of sins." The sense of all these Scriptures is one. The phrase "through the resurrection of Jesus Christ," with which the Apostle closes this verse, is to be construed with "save us," and it shows that in the symbolic relation of baptism to the death, burial, and the resurrection of Christ it is made the means of "bringing us to God." (v, 18.) Having sufficiently considered the *first* class of passages, or those which directly affirm a relation between baptism and "the remission of sins," but by parallel terms or phrases, we will proceed, as briefly as practicable, to examine the *second* class, or those which teach this relation by *clear implication*. We adduce as such the following: 1. "Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii, 5.) 2. "Know ye not that so many of you as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by (*διὰ*) baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." (Romans vi, 3, 4.) 3. "Baptizing them into (*eis*) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." (Matthew xxviii, 19.) 4. "For by (*ἐν*) one spirit are we all baptized into one body." (1 Corinthians xii, 13.) 5. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy saved he us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." (Titus iii, 5, 6.)

In the *first* of these passages we take "born of water" as equivalent to baptism. There is some difference of opinion as to this interpretation, but the general agreement is on its side. It is, therefore, equivalent to saying, "Except a man be baptized, he cannot enter the kingdom of God," and as sin is the only bar to our entrance into the kingdom, there is but little difference in meaning between "entering into or seeing the kingdom of God" and receiving the pardon of our sins. Baptism admits to the kingdom through the remission of sins.

The *second* of the passages quoted under this class presents baptism in relation to the most vital causes of our redemption. It represents Christians as "baptized into Jesus Christ," "into his death." Baptism thus brings us into relation with the sacrificial death of Christ, into fellowship with the atonement for sins, into participation with the last victorious struggle of the great Deliverer, suffering unto death for us. By the death of repentance we go to the burial of baptism. Where sin laid the Saviour, there we lay our sins, the "old man" crucified, with "the Lamb of God, slain from the foundation of the world." And thus, participating in the sin-pardoning merits of the atonement, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, so also we rise new creatures to walk a new life. Sin is put out of the way in the burial of baptism—"remitted," "pardoned," "washed away."

The *third* passage represents baptism as making us formally partakers of the divine nature in all its triune fullness. To be brought "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," this is to be a new creature, a child of God, an heir of eternal life. Does it not involve the remission of sins?

So with the *fourth* passage, "Baptized into one body." There is one faith, one baptism, and one body, and one formal condition of admission into that body, even baptism. But we are *really* made members of the

body of Christ only through the remission of our sins, and because this is received in baptism, therefore can it be said that "we are baptized into one body."

We shall close this detailed examination of Scriptures on this subject by a few remarks on Titus iii, 5, 6, where it is said, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy saved he us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." It is important to notice that this passage expressly denies the position often carelessly assumed with respect to baptism as a work of righteousness. Baptism, or the "washing of regeneration," is put into pointed antithesis to "works of righteousness." The latter cannot save us; the former, according to God's gracious appointment, does. Not, indeed, alone, but by the accompanying operation of the Spirit through the Word; nor yet as "a work of righteousness," having any efficacy or worth in itself, but as a gracious *sacrament* of Divine appointment, vouchsafed as the means of conferring and signifying pardon. Those who hastily conclude that the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins is subversive of the Pauline doctrine of *justification by faith without works*, would do well to consider that here it is expressly denied that the "bath of regeneration" is a work of righteousness at all. So far as the heart of man is concerned, faith is the *subjective* condition of his justification, but it is in no way inconsistent with this that the Author of our salvation should appoint a time and place, a form, in short, a *sacrament* in which he will recognize and formally accept the faithful heart, and confer upon it the blessing of pardon. "Regeneration," in the sense of the Scriptures, is not a sudden and sensible operation of the Holy Spirit, killing, as by a flash of lightning, the "old man," and springing into vigorous and conscious life the "new man." It is a process. Faith, repentance, and baptism are its stages of development, the Spirit and the Word the quickening, nourishing, and consummating agent in all. The chrysalis has life, but it is not until it has passed through silent and mysterious changes of death that it bursts forth the glorious butterfly, joyful in its regeneration, and free as the air in which it flies.

The studious reader—and we can scarcely expect that any other will be likely to go through this article—but the studious and discriminating reader will have observed that we have been governed by no theory of regeneration in our investigations, but that we have taken every passage of Scripture at its fair grammatical value as language, and accepted its lesson just as it is given by the words. This is the *method* of the inquiry, that we have not rested the conclusion which we reached upon a *single* passage of Scripture, nor upon the meaning and force of a *single* preposition, as is often superficially charged, but that we have established it upon the proper interpretation of many passages, each and every one of which we have shown, either directly or by *clear implication*, teaches the same great law of pardon; furthermore, that this doctrine is not only forced upon us by the letter of many Scriptures, but that it is in perfect harmony with a general doctrine of inspiration on the whole subject to which it relates.

Should any one conclude that this doctrine, which makes baptism a formal condition of pardon, places a limitation upon the free grace of God, and asks what right has man to do this, we might retort the question, and ask: Does not the making of faith an instrumental condition of justification equally place a limit upon the free grace of God? Or, again, What right has man to say that God shall not limit himself, if

He chooses so to do? "Who art thou, O man, that answerest against God?" But the question is a sophism. We are not bound to say, nor do we say, God forbid that we should say that none but the baptized will ever be saved. Infants die without faith, and vast continents of human beings have never heard the Gospel; and what shall become of all these, and some even in Christian lands almost as destitute of privileges and light as they, I thank God is a question not for me to decide. It would appall me to think that baptism stood between them and the free grace of God. My duty is to preach the Gospel as its Author has delivered it to me, and leave the rest to him; he will do all things right. But the true question is this, not do we limit the free grace of God, nor yet has God limited himself, but *has he limited us?* We say, *Yes, he has*—in kindness and mercy has he done so. He has not left us to say, lo here, and lo there; to seek for salvation in visions, and dreams, and fanatical fancies of inward operations delusively interpreted as the sensible work of the Spirit in our regeneration; but he has entered into formal covenant with us, given us a definite symbol and seal of pardon, a sacrament of grace in which he will meet us, and give us assurance of the remission of sins, and bestow upon us as our advocate and comforter, the Holy Spirit, to abide with us for ever; so that, "not by any works of righteousness which we do, but according to his mercy doth he save us by means of (*δία*) the bath of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." To His name be the praise forever! *

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

MINISTRY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.—No. VII.

ELDERS.

"For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting and ordain elders in every city." Titus i. 5.

SECTION five, of this series, having been devoted to the "Work of an Evangelist" we have in a measure contemplated the church under that provisional oversight which pertains to it when newly planted and while unable to possess elders and deacons. It has been objected, that the provisional oversight in churches planted by an evangelist, or transferred to him by those who planted them, falls but little short of the "One Man system"—that he has as much in his hands, and is as necessary, as the one and only pastor of a modern Baptist or Independent Church. To a certain extent this is true; and yet, even from the first, a wide difference is apparent. Look fairly into the two positions and it will appear that scarcely any two things can be more unlike. In the one case you have a man filling a provisional position and labouring to prepare men, or to discover their fitness if already prepared, that he may divide among them

* A note from S. S. of Banbury asks—"Would it not be better in the articles on Baptism and Remission of Sins, p. 181, to give the quotation from Acts ii. unutilized. 'Repent and be baptized every one of you in (or upon) the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins,' instead of 'Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins'?" It may be done simply to economize space and time, but do we not find fault with the economy of others, who quote Mark xvi. 'He that believeth shall be saved.'"

The article is reprinted, from the *Christian Quarterly*. We believe it to be from the pen of the President of Bethany College. It is not likely that he would thank us to add to his quotations, nor is it needful so to do. The text is cited merely to show that baptism stands in *some* relation to the remission of sin, and the *full* quotation would neither increase nor decrease the proof. It is sometimes cumbersome and useless to quote intervening clauses. Of course where the proposition affirmed would be affected by so doing the whole should be given. The case supposed from Mark xvi. is considerably different. We have reprinted the foregoing scholarly production in hope that readers will largely put it before their *intelligent* neighbours, and not because the brethren need information as to the relation between baptism and remission. That faith, repentance and baptism are *each* and *all* in order to the remission of sin is, with us, a settled point, and anyone who undertakes to deny that connection is simply ineligible for a place in our ranks as a preacher of the plan of salvation.

the work, office and oversight, which rest upon his shoulders, that, thus released, he may give all attention to rescuing of sinners from the power of Satan, or to the setting other churches in order. In the other case you behold a man who has made himself, or whom a perverse system has made, everlastingly necessary to the church in which he labours. He is *the* pastor—he is to feed them with the finest wheat—the pulpit, to which the whole church look for instruction is his—they come to be filled, he has to fill them. And this is to continue, not merely till the edification of the body can be committed to itself, but it is the summit of their wishes, beyond which they have no expectation. This man may (as is sometimes the case) spend fifty years with one church, and then be as necessary to it as at the beginning. Take him away, and send not one of his “order” to fill the vacant place, the “*interest*” expires. The popular pastor or minister is a creature of whom no trace can be found in the apostolic writings. He is *the elder*, though even fresh from college, not having seen years enough to furnish him with an ordinary knowledge of men and things. His office, so far as the New Testament enables us to trace its origin, arises from limiting to, and perpetuating the evangelist in, one church; dispensing with the qualifications for eldership; committing to the evangelist the work of a plurality of elders and also that of divers teaching brethren, so that he becomes truly *The One Man*. No wonder that colleges in nine cases out of ten fail to supply men equal to their task. That many modern pastors deserve to be noted for talent and efficiency in preaching and defending the doctrines for the propagation of which they are set, is cheerfully admitted; but, that any one ever did, or ever can, wholly fill the office to which they are called is unhesitatingly denied. A return to ministry, as instituted by the authority of Jesus, would leave abundant room and maintenance for all such labourers. Let each become an evangelist and set the church in order in which till now, as the only minister, he has laboured; then devote his entire time and ability to the enlargement thereof or the planting of others, sustained by that church, if agreeable to him and them. There is no reason why each church should not support an evangelist, or a half-dozen, if possessed of means, and surely the multitude perishing around furnish ample employment for a mighty army of preachers.

But who and what are Elders? They are those duly qualified members of the church who, by ordination, have had committed to them oversight in all matters appertaining to teaching, guiding, and ruling. They are not *all* the senior men, in the church; for many of that class know themselves completely destitute of duly specified qualifications. Nor do they consist of *all* those who think, feel, or judge, themselves qualified; for men often count themselves competent for office when all around know them as wholly unfit. Age is a first element in the duly qualified elder—not *non-age* nor *dotage*, but age sufficient to guarantee the requisites for an experimental acquaintance with men and things. The ancient nations appropriately filled important official positions from the ranks of their senior men. From the elders of Israel the Sanhedrim was constituted. The Greeks filled the magisterial office from their seniors. The Romans had their senatus composed of men marked by age and experience. But no nation has been guilty of the folly of making age the only qualification, nor of the absurdity of calling upon the aged to *take* office upon the ground of faith in their own fitness for the duties thereof, though this absurdity has been urged upon the churches.

Elder (πρόεδρος) in the New Testament is used to denote—1. Simply comparative age; as, “The elder son was in the field.” Luke xv. 25. 2. An

official person: a member of the Jewish Sanhedrim. Matt. xvi. 21. 3. An ordained officer in a church of God. Acts xi. 30: xiv. 23. In this particular, then, it is like *διάκονος* (deacon), used both in its *generic* and in its *appropriated* or official sense; and that too, both in the Jewish and in the Christian dispensation.

The ordained elders of the church in any one place are the presbytery (*πρεσβυτήριον*) of that church. The word occurs three times in the New Testament—twice applied to the Jewish Sanhedrim, (Luke xxii. 6: Acts xxii. 5) and once to the church (1 Tim. iv. 14). Elders have official standing only in the church in which they are members and as ordination confers office only in the one church in which it takes place, elsewhere they are not elders and, consequently, form no caste, clergy, or order, claiming official status and distinctive titles wherever they may go.

Elders are also designated Bishops, Overseers, Pastors. That these several terms are applied in relation to one and the same office is apparent. Paul from Miletus "sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the Church," and when they came he said unto them, "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you OVERSEERS, to FEED the Church of God." Acts xx. 17—28. Here the elders sent for by Paul, are designated *overseers* and the word thus rendered (*ἐπίσκοπος*) is, in every other instance in the New Testament, represented by BISHOP. Thus, then, the elders are termed *bishops*, or *overseers*; and required to *feed*, or *tend*, the *flock*, which is the work of a *shepherd* or *pastor*.

We also read, "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain ELDERS in every city, as I had appointed thee; if any be blameless, . . . for a BISHOP must be blameless." Titus i. 5. Here, most clearly, the terms *elders* and *bishops* are used interchangeably.

Again, "The elders among you I exhort, who am a fellow-elder *tend* the flock of God, which is among you, OVERSEEING it not by constraint but willingly, not by base gain but with good will: neither as being lords over the heritage, but being examples to the flock. And when the Chief Shepherd is manifested, ye shall receive the unfading crown of glory." i. Peter v. 1—4. Here, too, the elders are *shepherds* or *pastors*, who have to *tend the flock*. They, too, are *bishops* or *overseers* and, as such, are to oversee the flock, willingly and not for base gain. As pastors or shepherds, they are under a chief shepherd, from whom they will receive their reward. It is, then, as clear as demonstration can make it, that elder, pastor or shepherd, and bishop or overseer, are terms appertaining to one and the same office in the *Church of God*.

In saying that the terms bishop, overseer, pastor, and shepherd appertain to one and the same office and that each is applied to the elder, we must be understood to mean that it is so in the English New Testament. To the reader of the Greek the number of words so applied is fewer. In the English we have both *pastor* and *shepherd* where in the original *ποιμήν* only is found, of which *shepherd* is the exact equivalent. The term *pastor* is from the Latin, and originally signified a shepherd. But it is now come frequently to denote a hired preacher, as distinguished from the elders of the church, neither an elder nor an evangelist. As, then, *shepherd* is the true idea, expressed by the term in Bible usage, let us speak of our elders as the *shepherds* of the flock and leave the term *pastor* for those who have improved upon apostolic order. So, too, with the term *bishop*. Overseer, we have seen is once used to translate *ἐπίσκοπος* while in the other instances it is represented by *bishop*. We have here two words, where in the

original there is but one. One of these two (overseer) exactly represents the term it translates. It is pure and simple English that everyone understands. The other (bishop) is but a corruption of *ἐπίσκοπος*, which came into our tongue by means of the Anglo-Saxon, and, thus traced back, means an overseer. But, then, the State Church has appropriated and perverted it. Turn to the Dictionary and you read—"BISHOP, one of the head order of the clergy" (*Walker*)—"BISHOP, a prelate, one who has the spiritual government of a diocese" (*Maunders*.) We propose then to allow the term bishop to appertain to the diocese as the special designation of a Roman or Anglican clerical head-centre. The Elders of the Church of God are simply the OVERSEERS and SHEPHERDS of the flock, under shepherds to the Chief Shepherd, who is head over all.

The duties imposed upon the Eldership, or Presbytery, of a church are most important. Though elders are not essential to the being of a church they are most certainly indispensable to its well-being. Still elder making has not always proved beneficial. Instances, not a few, are before us in which it has proved the bane of the church and led to strife and division. But the evils thus arising spring not from the apostolic plan, but arise solely from misunderstanding its requirements. Churches make elders without regard to the required qualifications; whereas they are authorized to do so only when the qualified men are manifested. Misrule is the result. There are brethren who, under provisional arrangement can do good service in filling up what is wanting, owing to the absence of an eldership, who, if ordained elders, would ruin the church. Much evil, too, has arisen from the absence of a proper understanding of the duties of the office. Now, unless the church and its elders see alike in this respect, an outbreak is pretty certain, sooner or later. We are even inclined to think that a clear understanding of what the church expects of the elders and what they are not to take upon themselves, is more important than a perfectly accurate conception of the work intended to be committed to their charge. In every case the church, on the one hand, and the overseers, on the other, should distinctly comprehend what is to be committed to the elders by the approaching ordination, and their induction into office should, in no case, take place until it is ascertained that they and the church are, in this particular, perfectly of the same mind.

Some have expressed regret that we have not a statement of the duties of the eldership as concise and distinct as Paul's statement of what a man *must be* who fills the office. Such statement would, no doubt, be quite convenient, but most likely the reason of its not having been given is to be found in the fact that it is not absolutely needful; and, certainly, it is not thus requisite, for the terms by which the official elder is designated, together with the stated qualifications, clearly enough indicate the duties imposed upon him. With this thought in mind we turn to a series of articles from the pen of our esteemed Br. McGarvey, now in course of publication in the *Apostolic Times*, which, on this particular point, so completely expresses what we have been in the habit of teaching that we shall save some hours of writing by adopting the following commendable statement of the case.

THE ELDERSHIP—ITS DUTIES.

"The titles of an office are often taken from some characteristic duty belonging to it. Thus the title President is taken from the act of presiding; Secretary from the act of writing; Auditor (*hearer*) from the act of hearing financial reports. In such cases the information derived

from the title is generally meagre. In some instances, however, offices newly created adopt the titles of previously existing offices which are similar to them; and in such instances the titles carry with them all of their previous significance except so far as this is modified by the nature of the new office. Thus the term *President*, which first meant one who presides over an assembly and enforces order in its proceedings, when transferred to the chief officer of a college, and to the chief magistrate of the United States, carried with it the chief part of its previously acquired meaning. Now, it so happens that all the titles by which the Elder of a church is known were adopted from previously existing offices, and brought with them in their new application much of their former significance. They will enable us, therefore, to obtain a general idea of the duties of the office, and to better appreciate the more specific statements of the Apostles which will afterwards be considered.

The title *Elder*, which is most frequently used by the Apostles, and which is still the most popular of these titles, obtained an official signification among the Jews long before its adoption into the Christian Church. Originally it designated the older men, or heads of families in Israel, who exercised a patriarchal government over their posterity, e.g., Ex. iv. 29; xix. 7. In the days of Christ it had become the title of the rulers of the Jewish synagogues, and of one of the classes composing the Sanhedrim. Reliable information in reference to the functions of the office among the Jews is quite meagre, but it is sufficient to justify the assertion that those who enjoyed the title exercised authority in some capacity. When it was adopted, therefore, into the Christian Church, it brought with it at least this general idea, that those to whom it was applied were rulers in the church. The exact nature and limits of their authority it could not of course designate.

The term *episcopos* brought with it a more clearly defined significance, and furnishes more definite information in reference to the duties of the office. Among the Athenians it was the title of 'magistrates sent out to tributary cities, to organize and govern them.' (See Robinson's New Testament Lexicon, and references there given.) Among the Jews it had very much that variety of application which the term *overseer* now has in English. It is used in the Septuagint for the officers appointed by Josiah to oversee the workmen engaged in repairing the temple, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 12—17; for the overseers of workmen employed in rebuilding Jerusalem after the captivity; Neh. xi. 5—14; for the overseers of the Levites on duty in Jerusalem; Neh. xi. 22; for the overseers of the singers in the temple worship; Neh. xii. 42; and for subordinate civil rulers; Jos. Ant. 10. 4. 2. In all these instances it designates persons who have oversight of other persons for the purpose of directing their labours and securing faithful performance of the tasks assigned them.

Such a word when applied to a class of officers in the Christian Church, necessarily carried with it the significance already attached to it. It indicated, both to the Jew and Greek, that the persons so styled were appointed to superintend the affairs of the church, to direct the activities of the members to see that everything was done that should be done, and that it was done by the right person, at the right time, and in the right way. Anything less than this would be insufficient to justify the title *overseer* as it was currently employed in that age. The details of the process by which all this was accomplished will appear as we advance.

The title *Shepherd* is still more significant than either of the other two. The Jewish shepherd was at once the ruler, the guide, the protector; and

the companion of his flock. Often, like the shepherds to whom the angel announced the glad tidings of great joy, he slept upon the ground beside his sheep at night. Sometimes, when prowling wolves came near to rend and scatter the flock, his courage was put to the test (Jno. x: 12); and even the lion and the bear in earlier ages rose up against the brave defender of the sheep. 1 Sam. xvii. 34—36. He did not *drive* them to water and to pasturage; but he called his own sheep by name so familiar was he with every one of them, and he *led* them out, and went *before* them, and the sheep *followed* him, for they knew his voice. Jno. x. 8, 4.

A relation so authoritative and at the same time so tender as this could not fail to find a place in the poetry of Hebrew prophets, and the parables of the Son of God. David's poetic eye detects the likeness between the shepherd's care of his flock and the care of God for Israel, and most beautifully does he give expression to it in lines familiar to every household, and admired in every land:

'The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want,
He maketh me to lie down in green pastures;
He leadeth me beside the still waters,
He restoreth my soul:
He leadeth me in the the paths of righteousness for
his names' sake.
Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow
of death, I will fear no evil:
For thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they
comfort me.'—Ps. xxiii.

The same beautiful image is employed by Isaiah, when with prophetic eye he sees the great Persian king gathering together the scattered sheep of Israel in distant Babylon, and sending them back from their long captivity. He exclaims in the name of the Lord, 'Cyrus is my *shepherd*, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the temple, thy foundations shall be laid.' Isaiah xlv. 28. But he sings a still sweeter note in the same strain, when he foresees the life and labours of the Son of God, and exclaims, 'He shall feed his flock like a *shepherd*; he shall gather the lambs with his arms, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young.' Isaiah xl. 11. The Saviour Himself re-echoes the sentiment, and says, 'I am the good shepherd;' 'I know my sheep, and am known by mine;' 'I lay down my life for the sheep.' Jno. x. 14, 15. Even the less poetic Paul is touched by the beautiful metaphor, and makes a prayer to 'the God of peace who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep' (Gal. xiii. 20); while Peter says to his brethren, 'Ye *were* as sheep going astray; but now are returned to the Shepherd and Overseer of your souls.' 1 Pet. ii. 25.

A word thus highly exalted by the pens of prophets, and even by the lips of Jesus, would appear almost too sacred to represent the relations and responsibilities of an uninspired labourer in the cause of God. But even before the church came into existence it had been consecrated to this usage, and was a favourite term with the later prophets by which to designate the religious leaders of Israel. Jeremiah pronounces a woe upon the shepherds of his day who destroyed and scattered Israel, and predicts the time when God would bring them again to their folds, and set up shepherds over them who would be real shepherds to them. Jer. xxiii. 1—4. The connection shows that the prediction has reference to the Christian age. Ezekiel speaks in the same strain, and in almost the identical thoughts of Jeremiah, except that in contrast with the

unfaithful shepherds of his age, he says: 'I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David: he shall feed them, he shall be their shepherd.' Ez. xxiv. 1—23.

With such a history, the word shepherd came into the terminology of the church with a most clearly defined secondary meaning. When applied as a title in the church it necessarily represented its subject as the ruler, the guide, the protector, and the companion of the members of the church. When Paul and Peter, therefore, exhorted the elders to be shepherds to the flock of God, all these important and tender relations were indicated by the word.

In two distinct passages already quoted, (Acts xx. 28; 1. Pet. v. 2) the elders are exhorted to be *shepherds* to the church. This exhortation, or rather this apostolic command, has failed to make its due impression on the English reader, because of the very inadequate translation of *poimaino* in the common version. It occurs eleven times, and is seven times rendered *feed*, and four times *rule*. When connected with church work it is uniformly rendered *feed*. No doubt the translators intended by this rendering to make their version intelligible to their uneducated readers in England and Scotland, where very little is known of a shepherd's work except *feeding* the sheep through the long winters. But this attempt at adaptation has led to serious misapprehensions; for even to this day, and in America as well as Great Britain, the term *feed* in these passages has been understood by the masses as a metaphor for public teaching, and the whole work here enjoined is supposed to be accomplished when a suitable address is delivered to the saints on the Lord's day. Many an elder has imagined that the chief part of his work is accomplished when he has called together the flock once a week, or it may be, once a month, and given them their regular supply of food, even when the food given is nothing better than empty husks. And many an evangelist, miscalling himself a pastor, has laboured under the same mistake. Let it be noted, then, and never be forgotten that the term employed in these passages expresses the *entire work of a shepherd*, of which *feeding* was very seldom even a part in the country where this use of the term originated. The shepherds of Judea, and those of Asia Minor *pastured* their sheep throughout the entire year. Their duty was to guide them from place to place, to protect them from wild beasts, and to keep them from straying; but not to *feed* them.

The Apostle Paul leaves us in no doubt as to his own use of the term in question; for after the general command, 'Be shepherds to the church,' he proceeds to distribute the idea by adding these words: 'For I know this, that after my departure shall ravenous *wolves* enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also, of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them. Therefore, *watch*; and remember that by the space of three years, I ceased not to warn every one, night and day with tears.' Acts xx. 28—31. Here, continuing the metaphor of a flock, he forewarns the shepherds against ravenous wolves, who can be no other than teachers of error, who would come into Ephesus from abroad, such, for example, as those who had already infested the Galatian churches (Gal. i. 6—7; v. 12); and he commands them to *watch*. He also predicts that men of their own number, like unruly rams of the flock, would rise up speaking *perverse* things, and seeking to lead away disciples after them. The shepherds were to watch against these also, and as they saw symptoms of such movements within, they were to '*warn every one, night and day*,' as Paul had done.

Here, then, are two specifications under the generic idea of acting the

shepherd, and they are strictly analogos to the work of a literal shepherd. It is made the duty of the eldership *first*, to protect the congregation against false teachers from abroad; *second*, to guard carefully against the influence of schismatics within the congregation; *third*, to *keep watch* both within and without, like a shepherd night and day watching his flock, so as to be ready to act on the first appearance of danger from either direction.

The first of these duties is again emphasized in the epistle to Titus, where Paul requires that elders shall be able by sound teaching both to exhort and convict the gainsayers, and adds: 'For there are many vain and unruly talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped.' Tim. i. 9—11. The duty of watchfulness is also mentioned again, and in a manner which shows most impressively its supreme importance. Paul says, 'Obey them who have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; *for they watch for your souls*, as they that must give account.' Heb. xiii. 17. From these words it appears that the object of the watching enjoined is not merely to keep out false teaching and to suppress incipient schism, but to do these in order to save souls from being lost. That priceless treasure for which Jesus laid down His life is at stake, and the elders of each church, like the shepherds of each flock, must give account to the owner of the flock for every soul that is lost. The task of Jacob, concerning which he said to Laban, 'That which was torn of beasts I brought not to thee, I bore the loss of it; of my hand didst thou require it, whether stolen by day or stolen by night;' is a true symbol of the task assigned the shepherds of the Church of God. Well might they all exclaim, 'Who is sufficient for these things?'

The duty of 'taking oversight' is enjoined upon the elders in express terms, and the expression is used as the equivalent of acting the shepherd. Peter says, '*Be shepherds to the flock, taking the oversight thereof.*' 1 Pet. v. 2. But the essential thought in the overseership, that of *ruling*, is frequently enjoined. Paul says to Timothy, 'Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour.' 1 Tim. v. 17. The Greek word here rendered *rule* is *proistemi*, the etymological meaning of which is to *stand* or *place* one object *before* another. But the fact that rulers stand before their subjects, with all the eyes of the latter looking to them for direction, led to the established usage of this term in the sense of ruling. It is so defined in the lexicons, and so used in both classic and Hellenistic Greek. It expresses the rule of a father over his family, 1 Tim. iii. 4, 5—12; of a deputy over a district, 1 Mac. v. 15; of a King over his subjects, Jos. Ant. viii. 12. 3; and of the elders over the church, 1 Tim. v. 17; 1 Thess. v. 12; Rom. xii. 8.

By use of still another Greek word, Paul expresses in the epistle to the Hebrews the same general idea of ruling. He says (xiii. 7), 'Remember *them who have the rule* over you, who have spoken to you the word of God;' again (verse 17), 'Obey *them that have the rule* over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls as they that must give account,' etc.; and again (verse 24), 'Salute *them that have the rule* over you.' The term here employed *heegeomia*, means, primarily, to *lead*. When applied to the mind it means to think or suppose, because in this mental act the mind is *led* to a conclusion. See Acts xxvi. 2; Phil. ii. 3—6; *et al.* But the *present participle* of this verb came to be used in the sense of *ruler*, because a ruler is one who *leads*. Sometimes, indeed, it means a *leader* in the sense of a *chief man*, as when Silas and Judas are called '*chief men* among the brethren.' Acts xv. 22. When the idea of ruling is expressed

by it, the fact is indicated in the context: *e.g.*, Pharaoh made Joseph 'ruler (*heegounenon*) over Egypt' (Acts vii. 10), where the expression 'over Egypt' indicates the relation of authority. So, in the second of the three examples under discussion, the terms *obey* and *submit yourselves* show that the relation of authority is expressed, and that the rendering of the participle should be *rulers*, or '*them who have the rule*.'

Another duty of the eldership, distinct from the preceding, is that of *teaching*. By a mistake already mentioned, this duty has been supposed by many to be the chief work indicated by the term pastor or shepherd; but in the only place where the latter term occurs in its appropriated sense in the common version, pastors are distinguished from teachers. 'He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, *pastors* and *teachers*.' The distinction here evidently made between pastors and teachers does not imply that they are always different persons; for one person might be both a prophet and an evangelist, and for the same reason he might be both a pastor and a teacher. But in the distribution of labours there is such a distinction made as to show that one might be a teacher and not a pastor. From other passages, however, we know that all pastors or shepherds, in addition to what is implied in this title, are also *teachers*. In the statement of their qualifications, Paul says that they must be 'apt to teach,' 1 Tim. iii. 2; and that they should be 'able by sound teaching, both to exhort and to convict the gainsayers,' Tit. i. 9. That they should possess this qualification, necessarily implies the duty of teaching."

Here for another month we must leave this interesting enquiry. Several points yet present themselves as requiring notice, and, perhaps, our readers will suggest others.

D. K.

THE RESERVED INHERITANCE.

"An Inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in Heaven for you," etc. 1 Peter i. 4, 5.

In itself and for itself no created thing is valuable. The sun does not feel its own beam, nor rejoice in its own light. The lightning is blind to its own blaze, and the thunder deaf to its own pealing. Spring is not charmed with its own beauty, nor is summer proud that her golden fingers weave the wreath that crowns a year of plenty. Created things have but relative value. The sea breeze may fan the arc of tropic Isles, but if no heat-oppressed resident be there, its grateful breathings will come unwelcome and depart unfelt. The clouds surcharged with showers may pour them vainly on the thirsty ground, if no eye and hand exist to view the pleasing changes and pluck the ripened fruits. Earth's framework might be of iron; her veins filled with liquid gold; her bosom decked with pearl and gem; yet valueless would her treasures be, were not man her lord and denizen. The like relative value, of either things temporal or spiritual, rises, too, in proportion to our conscious need of, or desire for, them. The wintry wind, whose close acquaintance the invalid and ill-clad shudder to make, will find its kisses grateful to the fevered and sunny brow. The cup of cold water, insipid to the vitiated palate of the epicure, is as nectar to the dying soldier on the battle field. It is the position we occupy and feelings we entertain that render things to us uninteresting or pleasing useless or precious. The sick value healing; the captive liberty; the lost salvation. Hence to the exile how glad the tidings when the powers that banished him bid him return. How cheer-

ing to captive Africans the cannons' boom and shouts of a British crew that predict their speedy liberation from the reeking hold and the tyrants' power. How inspiring to the hard pressed band to hear the battle cry of gallant comrades who are rushing to their side to throw themselves with heart and weapon upon the foe. And above all how cheering to those strangers scattered abroad throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, etc., as chaff by persecuting storms, to learn that for them whose goods were spoiled, whose friends alienated, for them who had no homes nor certain dwelling-places, was reserved in Heaven an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away. Refreshing as evening dew to the fainting flower, must such words have been to their spirits, and sweeter their sound than were the songs of the sanctuary of David, on his return from banishment. Brethren, let us look at this inheritance! May it lead us nearer to the Saviour, and stimulate us to live as strangers and pilgrims looking for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God!

It is "*Incorruptible*," and thus differs in nature from all that ever met the eye of man. Upon everything that is made may have been written Ichabod! Ichabod! (The glory has departed.) The marble palaces of ancient Kings, the rude but gigantic temples of an antique age, the monumental memorials of the warrior fame that have seen the tide of conquest ebb and flow upon the stream of time, which nevertheless, bore victor and vanquished away, have lost the pristine glory which boasted of immortality. The breath of time has mouldered them; the foot of time has trampled them. The blue heavens above us bent—chiefest symbols of purity and permanence—shall decay, they shall wax old as a garment, and as a vesture shall God change them and they shall be changed. The worlds that but yesterday were rolled from the Creator's hands shall ripen like fruit with age, weary with the weight of years, and corrupting fall from their several spheres. *But this inheritance is incorruptible*, the fine gold of its streets will never grow dim, the lustre of its gates of pearl will not wax faint, and the varied tints of the jasper throne will never pale. The water of the river of life will never lose its crystal clearness, nor will there be even dead branches to prune, or wasting worthless fruit to remove from the tree of life, upon its banks. The waves of the everlasting ages may roll on to the shores of this inheritance and bear nothing of wreck with them; they may roll off again but shall carry nothing that is precious away; its excellences, all brighter than the summer sun, will be young when eternity grows old, and radiant with light when all the luminaries of the sky have withdrawn their shining. Yet whence the desirability of such an inheritance, if the heirs it is reserved for are corruptible: Does not the eye wax dim and the heart grow old and furrowed with grief as the brow with care? Do not the sun-bright locks of youthful pride sorrow into winter's whiteness, or thin themselves one by one away? Does not death live within us, and the bloom of health and beauty fade beneath one touch of his corrupting finger or withering breath? If in ourselves exist these symptoms of decay, what benefit to such will be an incorruptible inheritance? None surely: but blessed be the name of Jesus, we are to be invested with a glorious body blooming with immortality; a body that shall know no pain, no decay. These humble bodies of ours are to be made like unto Christ's glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able to subdue all things unto Himself. Not only shall we see Him as He is but we shall be made like Him. Verily, fellow pilgrims, our hearts burn within while we think of that all glorious time—

"When saints in body and in mind
Shall in their Saviour's image shine."

Thus much for the first excellence, and for rarity the second is like unto it. "*Undefiled.*" The world may be challenged for its parallel. Here right is very often overcome by might; there is nought but defilement. Crowns for the most part are stained with innocent blood which tyrants have shed. Dynasties have frequently been established by cruelty. The first broad acres of ancestral lands were frequently the patrimonies of godless Naboths, and the streams where ancestral trees struck deep their roots and spread wide their branches were oftener turbid and foul at their source than pure. The rich and the great have aggregated to themselves the land and although the Creator hath designed the earth should be tilled that it may bring forth food both for man and beast, yet these His creatures have the audacity to decree that vast tracts of land shall neither have spade nor plough to touch them, consequently thousands are now pining for want in a land abounding with wealth and plenty. Truly such are defiled inheritances. But happy it is to know that the heavenly inheritance was gotten not by might but by right. Though to Christians a free bestowment, Christ had to procure it for them, the price was His own blood, and by the right of purchase He now holds it for His true followers. It is undefiled. Sin, that like a moral leprosy, makes unclean the very walls of the houses in which we dwell—sin, that defiles whatever it touches, as one breath bedims the mirror it falls upon—sin that causes so much misery, degradation and death, by decree immutable is banished from this inheritance. Its virgin purity shall remain unsullied because there shall in nowise enter into it anything that defileth, or that worketh abomination, or that maketh a lie. None shall have access but those who are written in the Lamb's book of life.

"None shall have admittance there
But followers of the Lamb."

These excellencies go on to perfection, for it is not only incorruptible and undefiled but it "*fadeth not away.*" Most sweet is that song—"The winter is past, the rain is over and gone, the flowers appear on the earth and the time of the singing of birds is come. Yet surely we need a gloomy dirge for their departure; they all fade away; the most beautiful being invariably the most fragile and fleeting: for the sun is no sooner risen with a burning heat than it withers the herb and its flowers falleth, and the beauty of its appearance perisheth. The fields of living green, unweaved with the parti-coloured flowers of spring, retain their glory little longer than the gorgeous evening cloud. The trees, gay in their vernal pride, soon lose their glossy bloom; the ruthless moth preys upon them; the dust of summer begrimes them, the fiery sun scorches them; and whirling one by one their once green robes leave them shorn; and exposed to the wintry wind and storm. But the beauty of this inheritance never fades away.

"There everlasting spring abides,
And never-withering flowers."

No heavy splashing rain-drops bruise and break them; no breath of winter chills them; no hot winds sweep over its smiling plains and scorch them; ever there are the pastures green, for the river of the water of life runs through them; never are the trees upon its banks fruitless. This, though delightful, might excite regret, were the glory of the heirs found to be less enduring, than that of the inheritance. But the truth is the reverse, for the robes of the ransomed which when bestowed are whiter than snow, and their crowns which when given are brighter than the mid-day sun, shall never be stained while the Redeemer's robes are pure; shall

never grow dim so long as the Mediator's crown gleams the glory of Heaven. Nor shall their immortality fade while the stamp of immortality is seen upon the Saviour's brow; the glorious truth will ever remain the same—"Because I live ye shall live also."

Thus far the intelligence creates delight, whereas the introduction of one doubt as to its continuance is enough to mar the pleasing contemplation of one day possessing it. Let us then consider its *security*. This arises not because its foundations are deep, its walls high, or its gates strong, but that God is its guard and preserver. It is *reserved* in Heaven, it is committed not to the custody of any spirit, however exalted and strong, but to the safe keeping of a faithful Creator. Its safety consists in Christ being its King. The first Adam to whom was committed the care of the first Paradise walked but for a little while through its unblighted groves, when he fell and that Paradise was lost. But the second Adam will preserve the Heavenly inheritance for ever.

Satan can never contaminate the Paradise of our eternal inheritance. Hence his present devices against the children of God, which demand most prayerful vigilance on our part, would occasion the greatest alarm were we not certified of the safety of the believer. "Kept by the power of God," kept as a child by his parents from danger; as a ward by his guardian from avaricious designers. What a life-giving truth to those whom perils surround, whom dangers threaten because of their loyalty to Christ. It is exemplified in the history of all the ancient worthies. Joseph by the power of God was kept unharmed from the murderous purposes of his brethren, and afterwards from the seduction and rage of the Egyptian. Moses was preserved in infancy, and from the wrath of a subsequent Pharaoh. It is this same power that now preserves believers. The gospel, which is God's power to save, is proof against all the fiery darts of the enemy; it lives and never dies; it is truth and cannot decay; it overcomes but to give victory to the vanquished. But although the gospel of Jesus is thus powerful, it must be believed before it can produce any change whatever. This is not only true as regards accepting salvation, but also all through the life of the believer. Hence we walk by faith; we live by faith; we are kept by the power of God *through faith*. Thus the Creator works in unison and harmony with the creature. The believer must cling to God as would a child to his father in the hour of danger. What matters it that the oak is the hero of a thousand storms, the ivy must cling to it to withstand the shocks of the mighty wind; and what avails that God is almighty and powerful to keep us if with heart and hand we hold not continually to Him. The name of the Lord is a strong haven, the righteous run into it and find safety. But the inheritance is reserved "*ready to be revealed in the last time*." When that time comes the inheritors will be ready for the inheritance, and the inheritance ready for the inheritors. When all is ready it will be revealed. Then shall the feast of love begin, and the undying harmony shall swell; then shall Jesus be glorified in His saints, and admired in all them that believe. No sin shall invade this Kingdom; no cries shall mingle with its songs, but that of victory to the Lamb; no spoiler shall ravish and destroy; no fear shall contend with love; the reign of peace will never end; and in the presence of God there will be fulness of joy; at His right hand pleasures for evermore.

Brethren in hope of such an inheritance, let patience have her perfect work, and let us exhibit our love for Christ and souls by a holy life and a burning desire to save sinners and edify the Church. Those of

the brethren whom God has prospered in this world's goods, and who therefore are His stewards, how should this delightful prospect stimulate you to every right use of the means God has blessed you with, in order to further His claims and extend His kingdom; knowing that we are not our own but are bought with a price, and therefore should yield ourselves body, soul, and spirit to Him: which is our reasonable service.

Let the tried and afflicted look forward to this Heavenly inheritance. Your difficulties are great and your troubles many, but our light affliction worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory, while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are unseen. He that overcometh, not he that is overcome, wins and wears the crown. You have seen the lark rise from its grassy bed to pour forth his song in the skies—you have watched him contend with the baffling wind; now beaten back; now rising on still vigorous wing, until he towers into the calm bright heights of Heaven and, with the storm beneath him, rings out his merry song to his Maker. And thus should the christian struggle, conquer, and sing

"Nearer my God to Thee
Nearer to Thee,
E'en tho' it be a cross that raiseth me,
Still all my song shall be;
Nearer my God to Thee,
Nearer to Thee."

Brighton.

B. ELLIS.

SHADOWS ON THE WALL.

LET belfires blaze by night, and clear silver trumpets blow,
And human hearts leap up, and sweet human faces glow;
In solemn banquets pour the purple and gladdening wine;
For tidings of such grace, so quickening and divine,
Will surely kindle up the fire of a higher life,
And make a solemn pause in the lists of human strife!

We have a grand old house, with the richest noble blood,
Which surely runs rejoicing in a free and generous flood.
Our great father Adam jabbered to the moon;
A speechless, brainless ape, gorilla, or lewd baboon,
Swung by his graceful tail from branches of chestnut tree;
While holy Eve below danced wild in her savage glee!
Does it not run like fire? Is it not truly sublime?
We bask and sun ourselves in the glory of such a prime.
With such illustrious fathers, so wrinkled manifold,
A noble house of memories, so fair, and stately, and old,
We feel our inward dignity, and collect our massive power,
To meet the evolution of every burdened hour.

We need such wine of life—such thoughts which kindle and burn,
As potent fates do mutter, that we ourselves in turn
May vanish from this planet, yielding up our place
Unto another order, and a still mightier race.
Our glory fades away, and our finest gold grows dim,
And all is hollow—hollow, from man to Seraphim!
The individual dies, and the valiant races pass,
Like shadows over corn, or waving clover and grass;

Man hastens in his fever to coffin and shadowy pall,
Sinks in the black river—and the grave endeth all !
How stirring to souls ! as the blare of a trumpet by night—
Eternity's phantoms—as eagles when scared take their flight !
Laid in the rotting dust, to turn or stir nevermore,
While rivers run to the sea, or the sea washes the shore.
The soaring lark of morn, or the evening nightingale,
May sing over the dead, but melody cannot prevail !
In vain may thunders roar, or the dark-winged tempest rave,
Or earthquake moan below the desolate, heedless grave.
But after the fever of life, with all its bustle and glare,
In that abyss of rest—What must it be to be there ?

But then—another wind shrieks over the ancient deep ;
Men *cannot* rest in graves, or souls their dim cloisters keep !
From couches of rose or fire they "troop to the Wizard's call,"
With tidings unspeakable, on *tables which climb the wall*.
Now let the earth be glad with song so fervent and free,
And branches of life lie thick in the mirth of jubilee ;
Scatter the pansies sweet, and go where the woodbine trails—
Have we not reached the HOLIES through all the temple veils ?
We need no training now in peril or fasting or prayer,
No culture austere in the cave, or cries on the desert air,
No coals of living fire, or wheels with resplendent eyes,
No horses and chariots of light to plough the wondering skies !
The Hebrew visions are gone from the faith of reasoning man,
And the old seers languish, solitary and wan.
'Tis not old documents that are needed in our strife,
But living inspiration, to fight the battle of life ;
And so, in darkened rooms, with steaming sensation so fine,
We call back the dead, and get messages all divine.
Though a profane modern skald, a master of jeers and japes,
Comes down upon our liturgy, as that of "Dead Sea Apes,"
And ancient seers were one in denouncing wrath upon the head
Of our spiritual fathers—the living who sought the dead,
Shall we say "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die ?"
There are shadows upon the earth, and webs across the sky ;
Let us fatten in satyr woods or epicurean sty !
Ah, no ! leave the Sadducee scribe in his ribs of ice,
And with modern ghosts let the "*medium*" shuffle his dice :
But come to His feet whom all may understand—
The One who lived and died, and arose in Holy Land—
And wait with collected heart, and clear dilating eyes,
For the ROSE OF LIFE which will redden eastern skies—
For the presence of Him who, in glories manifold,
Will bring the banquet of love and the age of gold.

G. GREENWELL.

CALL yourself to often reckonings ; cast up your debts, payments, graces, wants, expenses, employments ; yield not to think your set devotions troublesome ; take not easy denials from yourself ; yea, give peremptory denials to yourself. He can never be any good that flatters himself. Hold nature to her allowance, and let your will stand at courtesy. Happy is that man who hath obtained to be the master of his own heart.—*Bishop Hall*.

Reviews, Notes, Passing Events, &c.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN ITS COMPLETENESS.

BY CALVIN E. STOWE, D. D.

THE New Testament in English, edited by Tischendorf and published by Tauchnitz, is a work of great merit in a scholarly point of view; but to those not fully acquainted with the subject, altogether deceptive, though not intentionally so. Such are apt to think that the three oldest manuscripts must be the best authority for the original text, and that what cannot be found in them, could not have been a part of the New Testament, as it came from the hand of the Apostles.

This is a great and mischievous mistake.

The three oldest manuscripts used by Tischendorf, date from the first quarter of the fourth to the middle of the fifth century, that is some two hundred and twenty-five years, at least, after the New Testament had been written, read in the churches and scattered all over the Christian world, liable to all the accidents incident to frequent transcription.

Now we have translations of the New Testament into various languages, Syrian, Egyptian, Ethiopic, beginning with the latter part of the second century.

From the first century to the fifth there are not less than ten of these translations, and they certainly are a much better authority than manuscripts which had no existence till early in the fourth century.

When these translations contain passages which are not contained in later manuscripts, the translations are much more likely to give the text as it stood in their time than the manuscripts.

The loss of a leaf (for these manuscripts are all in book form and not in rolls), the beginning in wrong

places by the translator after a rest from writing, and various other circumstances, may easily account for the unintentional *omission* in the manuscripts, but an *interpolation* must be intentional.

On these accounts and others that might be mentioned, it is easy to see that at least in regard to interpolations and omissions a good translation of the second or third century is a far more reliable authority for the original of the text than manuscript of the fourth or fifth century.

The ten translations, above alluded to, are, therefore, on these points, far more trustworthy than the three manuscripts used by Tischendorf in his new edition of the New Testament.

Again, we have numerous Christian writers from the first century to the fifth who constantly quote the New Testament as it stood in their time, and the quotations of the first three centuries are an earlier authority for the original text than any of the Tischendorf manuscripts.

There are some seventy-five of these writers, and their quotations are so numerous that if every manuscript of the New Testament were lost the substance of it could be produced from their writings.

Moreover, the manuscripts are all anonymous. We know not who wrote them; but the quotations are given with responsible names. We know the authors of the books in which they occur. It is true that these translations and the writings of the early Christian fathers are generally more or less incomplete, and the text somewhat varied, but the same is also true of the New

Testament manuscripts. In the very best manuscript (the Sinai) Tischendorf indicates five different classes or kinds of variations. On this point all the authorities, whether translations or manuscripts need careful editing; they all stand on precisely the same ground.

Now apply these principles to a single case by way of illustration.

The last chapter of Mark's Gospel, from the eighth verse onward, is omitted in the Sinai and Vatican manuscripts, but is contained in the Alexandrian. It is in all the Syrian, Egyptian and other translations of the second and third centuries, and it is quoted as the last part of Mark's Gospel by Irenæus, the most learned Christian writer of the second century, and the student of Polycarp, who had studied with the apostle John.

Irenæus tells us that he had the books of the Christian Scriptures in his possession at the very time when he was on terms of familiarity with Polycarp, daily listening to his accounts of what he had himself heard from John and others who had seen the Lord. See my History of the Books of the Bible, page 811, where the passage is quoted in full.

This chapter of Mark is also found in more than five hundred Greek manuscripts and also in the Latin and Gothic.

Now, which is the more probable, that all these *most ancient* witnesses had been deceived by an interpolation, or that, by some accident, the last leaf of Mark's Gospel had been dropped out from the manuscript from which the Sinai and Vatican copied?

From this statement of fact it is obvious that anyone who should, in making a revised text of the New Testament, strike out all that is not contained in the three oldest manuscripts used by Tischendorf, must be guilty of a very rash, unscholarly act, and makes a very faulty text. It is a remarkable fact, not to be lightly estimated, that a whole column of space is left blank in the Vatican MSS., as if the copyist had intended, but, for some reason, had omitted to fill it with the text.

Should you think it appropriate to the purposes of your paper, I should be happy to furnish a history of each of the texts omitted by Tischendorf.
—*Christian Union*.

BIBLE COLLEGE IN AUSTRALIA.*

EDITORS CHRISTIAN STANDARD:

Once more, through the guidance and guardian care of our heavenly Father, I am permitted to tread the shores of America. In company with our young brother, A. T. Magarey, I left Australia in the ship "Guiding Star," on January 22, and arrived at San Francisco in safety and improved health on May 4.

The leading objects of my visit are to lay before the brethren in America the important claims of "The Bible College of Australia," and obtain their hearty sympathy and aid, to

enable us to firmly establish this great auxiliary to the Church of Christ. I therefore request the attention of the faithful brethren to the following document and particulars:

ADELAIDE, SOUTH AUSTRALIA,
JAN. 3, 1870.

We take great pleasure in introducing and commending to your confidence and fellowship our esteemed brother, Henry S. Earl, whose labours in Australia, in the Lord's cause, have been abundant and successful, and who is now about to visit America to present the claims of "The Bible College of Australia," of which he is the authorized Financial Agent. We

* This appeal appears in our American Periodicals generally, and is commended by their editors. Ed.

trust his appeals on behalf of this necessary institution will be heartily responded to by the brethren, and that he will return to us laden with substantial assurances that the brethren in America feel a deep interest in the Lord's work in this important field of labour. We have commenced the work in earnest and in faith, by educating, under many difficulties and disadvantages, several suitable young brethren who have presented themselves for Biblical instruction, and we have determined, by the Lord's help, to complete this much needed auxiliary to the Church of Christ. One brother has promised four thousand pounds sterling—nearly equal to twenty thousand dollars—upon condition of an equal amount being subscribed. Owing to the commercial and pastoral distress which has so long existed in Australia, we feel it is impossible to raise the required sum without being largely assisted by the liberality of the friends of Jesus in America. To you, therefore, we appeal. Enable us to say that by the assistance of loving American Disciples of Christ we have been enabled to establish the first Bible College in Australia.

THOS. J. GORE.	G. L. SURBER.
THOS. MAGAREY.	OLIVER A. CARR.
PHILIP SANTO.	ANDREW THOMPSON.
SAMUEL KIDNER.	WM. ROBERTSON.

JOHN S. PERRY.

For the further information of the brethren, I may add that we purpose to have an institution similar to the Bible College of Kentucky University; and as numbers of poor but devoted and naturally gifted brethren have not the means to support themselves while studying for the "ministry of the word," we propose to establish a permanent fund, the interest of which will be devoted to the support of such brethren during their course of study. The imperative necessity of this institution is deeply felt by the brethren in Australia, and will be apparent to all who study the following facts. Six years ago the cause we plead was almost unknown in Australia. Now, thousands listen to its claims every Lord's day. Then, not one evangelist was in Australia. Now thirteen are wholly engaged in preaching the Gospel. Then, there were a few small churches meeting in cheap and unsuitable buildings. Now, we have large and flourishing churches, meet-

ing in neat and commodious chapels. Then, a baptism was a rare occurrence. Now, numbers are "baptized into Christ" every week. Then, the number of brethren did not exceed seven hundred. Now, we number about three thousand. In brief, I may further state, that during the past five years and nine months nearly two thousand five hundred have been added to the Church of Christ, several chapels have been built and others enlarged and refitted, four evangelists have been sent for to America with the necessary funds for travelling expenses, and three have nobly responded to our call for co-labourers, all the available Australian talent in the church has been brought into active service, and five brethren have been qualified for evangelists, who are now successfully engaged in "winning souls to Christ."

Other young brethren we have who possess the natural qualifications for good evangelists, but require development and training in order to be useful and efficient preachers. We have also many places unoccupied, where "the fields are already white unto harvest," but we lack the preachers, and therefore cannot respond to the loud and urgent cry, "Come over and help us." Brethren in Christ, we ask your assistance to enable us to qualify men to enter into these inviting fields. Let not our appeal to you be in vain. We are doing all we can in Australia to meet these imperative requirements of the cause of truth and righteousness, and the great need of dying sinners. Will you not help us in our noble endeavours? Will you not aid us to establish the first Bible College in Australia, and thus help to establish firmly and permanently the cause of pure Christianity in Australia? We confidently hope you will do so heartily and liberally. Disappoint us not in this our reasonable expectation, but freely and promptly haste to

render us the required assistance. As it will not be possible for me to visit all the churches during my short visit of a few months, I am under the necessity of requesting all brethren who will assist us to send their contributions to Henry S. Earl,

care of Mr. E. Earl, Metamora, Woodford County, Illinois, and they will be thankfully received, and duly acknowledged.

Yours in Christ,
HENRY S. EARL.

CLERGY MUTUAL INSURANCE LEAGUE.

In the *American Christian Review*, of May 24, we have the prospectus of the above-named league, which was last year organized and incorporated under the general law of Ohio. The clergy of whom the Board of Management is composed are named, and the bye-laws given. We suppose the insertion of the thing in the *A. C. R.*, is owing to the fact that some of our own pastors and evangelists, or whatever they may be termed, advertise themselves to the world as clergymen, by placing their names among those who form the Board of Managers to this Clerical Society. This, of course, is a pretty contemptible business. We are glad to believe that it is as heartily disapproved by the bulk of the brethren in America as it is by us all in this Country. Br. Franklin, Editor, of the *Review*, comments upon the affair thus:—

"We do the *clergy* the kindness to print in another column the bye-laws of their 'Mutual Insurance Company,' the time of the organization of the Company, and the names of the managers. It will be seen that this organization is in Mount Vernon, Ohio. We see the names of several men with whom we have a personal acquaintance, but had not learned that they were *clergymen*! The world '*does move*.' Had we the opportunity, and were we at all capable, it would afford us great pleasure to address these worthy gentlemen. But this not being the case, we shall have to be content with a few words in these columns:

1. If it were the constant study of the men styled 'the clergy,' to isolate themselves from other people,

by some kind of caste, distinction, or badge; form themselves into a class, a distinct order, an entirely different grade from other portions of mankind, they could not be making more successful progress. The tendency of their movements is to isolate themselves from all other people, destroy the common sympathy between themselves and the other portions of humanity, and make a kind of indefinite impression on the masses that they are a distinct order of beings, of an entirely different grade, endowed with special and peculiar privileges and demanding special and peculiar attentions and consideration. It is useless to inform any one the least acquainted with the Saviour, the apostles and the first preachers of the gospel and teachers in the faith of Christ, that nothing of this kind was known among them. They were not looking ahead and making these sharp arrangements in temporal things. They were men of faith, of confidence in God and his gracious and merciful care. They ate and drank, laboured and rested, as other pure and good men, and instead of some selfish provision for themselves in which all their brethren could not participate, their great care was for others; for the poor, the distressed and suffering. But these men, who will not fellowship each other, as *Christians*, league together in a worldly scheme, in *pecuniary fellowship*, as a dependence in case of accidents or misfortunes: throw their funds into a *mutual stock* for their own benefits, separate from their brethren! This *mutual* concern would make a singular appearance

by the side of the one that sprang into existence immediately after the founding of the church. That common stock was for the benefit of *any who had need—any in want*. But this is for *a class* in the church.

2. The class to be benefited by this 'Mutual League,' is not the weak, the unfortunate and dependent of mankind, or of the church, but the educated, talented, influential, and popular; the men who ought to be able to take care of themselves—to provide for their own as well as any other class. These powerful, influential and popular men, in the vigour of manhood, as little liable to misfortune as any others in human society, form themselves into a Mutual League, to secure their wives and children against the accidents and misfortunes of the world! This is the latest manifestation of clerical selfishness. Where is their concern for the weak, the afflicted; the lame, the halt and blind; the unfortunate, the poor and suffering, in their several communities? No concern manifested in this direction, by this League! Its great concern; its heartfelt solicitude, looks to *self*, to the talented, influential and popular; those more liable to receive charitable attention than any others, and more able to take care of themselves and their dependents. What an embodiment and manifestation of selfishness for these to form themselves into a Mutual League! They are rapidly isolating themselves from other people, cutting the cords of sympathy between themselves and others, and losing their influence over the masses. They are filling the lips of Infidels with arguments to destroy the church. This entire affair is a lowering down of manliness, independence and real nobility, on the part of the men who have gone into it.

3. What confidence have these men in the churches which they are spending their lives to care for and build up? Why not take their chances among their brethren, in the

mutual league ordained of God? This is the mutual insurance in which their brethren have to take their chances. Have the clergy no confidence in this mutual company, that they are driven into a selfish association of their *own*? If these men were trying to give to Infidels and all others a demonstration of their appreciation of their churches, their confidence in them and willingness to depend upon them, they could not have thought of a better method of doing it. How can they expect others to have any confidence in their churches to care for the poor, the unfortunate and the suffering, so long as they give such a demonstration of their utter want of confidence? The very persons who, on account of their popularity, in misfortune would receive relief, if any body would, thus show that they have no confidence in the church, *as a mutual insurance company*, to care for them or their dependents in the hour of trial and want. They turn away from the *divine company—the church*—for protection, to a special arrangement for an isolated class—for *themselves* and leave the poor, the humble and lowly, the obscure and unpopular, to depend on the church, or any thing else, or care for themselves! But we must dismiss these gentlemen, meantime giving them credit, as wiser in their generation than the children of the light.

4. If these gentlemen want insurance, why not secure a policy in some good company, the same as other men? In almost all the companies some courtesy is extended to men of their profession. Why not take out a policy as other men, in a similar company? That would not attract attention to them as a special *class*, give them any special note as *clergymen*. But again, we commend them as wise men, and commend to their prayerful consideration Matt. vi. 24—34. The Lord saw them and saw the things that would engage their attention. May they

be well provided for, so to teach the people of the things which the Gentiles seek."

Here we must leave our clerical brethren. Of course they claim that they are not moving off the apostolic lines nor retracing the steps taken by A. Campbell. But in all vast movements there are half-hearted professors—men who trim their

sails to every popular breeze. That there should come among us some such was to be expected, and their having come would not merit notice, were it not needful to promote caution on the part of those who stand firm, that they may be careful whom they invite and whom they receive as preachers. Ed.

AUSTRALIA, AND THE EDITOR'S LETTERS.

MELBOURNE, FEB. 25, 1870.

DEAR BRO. KING,

Your note I received last January, and have been thinking of sending you a word ever since. Of course you know what it is for a preacher of the gospel, in the very midst of pressing duties on every hand, to want a disposition to sit down and write when his time might be better employed in other things. Hence, I will not lengthen out an apology.

To-day, Friday, and to-morrow, Brother Barber and I set apart for study, and for that preparation of mind and heart which is so necessary to effective preaching.

We are trying to make full proof of our ministry by doing the work of Evangelists. We feel the necessity of committing instruction to faithful men, who will be able to teach others also. To this end we spend four hours every day instructing six brethren, who will ere long go forth to preach the word.

Throughout Australia and New Zealand our brethren are scattering, and we are continually receiving letters testifying their faithfulness in meeting regularly on the first day of the week to break bread. They go out from the churches in Melbourne, Adelaide, and Dunedin into the interior, and bear with them the gospel, and the love of Jesus in their hearts. They feel the necessity of spreading the truth, hence they do what they can at preaching the word, but they confess their inability to plead the cause of Jesus so as to win souls to Christ. Hence the cry comes up from quarters—"Send us men who can reach the public ear and show the way of life plainly." We hope to be able soon to answer some of these calls. Our great need in this abundant harvest is labourers, who can rightly divide the word of truth. Calls have been made on England and America for aid, and we believe there is certainly one Evangelist coming from England. Let me here express the hope that whatever prejudice there may be on the part of the brethren in this

country against the brethren in America, and against the brethren in England (I know there is such a prejudice), will not cool the ardour and zeal of the brethren in hailing with joy, and standing by the true man, no matter whence he comes. We want no half-hearted, narrow-minded sectarian spirit from America, nor from England, nor from any other place; and if an Angel from heaven should preach any other gospel, in advance, or behind, or in modification of the gospel of Christ as given in the New Testament, we would believe him accursed, and would not allow him to spread the curse among us. We are for the whole counsel of God. We are for the *letter* of the gospel, because we know that is the only way to get the *spirit* of it. Allow me here to state my conviction that much of the prejudice alluded to above, has been caused by the *British Harbinger*, in the following manner:—The *B. H.* undertook to set things in order in America, and instanced special aberrations from the "*Old Paths*." Many of the brethren here, who know not the fallacy of drawing general conclusions from particular premises, think that all the brotherhood in America is proceeding askew, because the *B. H.* mentioned some brethren in America who are deemed "unsound," and who are thought to be "retracing the steps" of—somebody; or "playing into the hands of the sects," &c. Now, the brethren in Australia do not take the American papers, and hence they do not know how earnestly our Editors in the United States are writing against innovations, &c.; they do not know that many of those fine, sound articles that have for the last six months covered from six to fifteen pages of the *British Harbinger* are reprints from our American papers, written by those brethren who have been suspected of unsoundness. Not long ago a brother here asked me what writer in *England* wrote those fine articles for the *B. H.* over the signature of C. L. L. I had to tell him that he was Charles Louis Loos, of Bethany College, Va. The question came up—Who

writes those sound racy pieces, such as "The Law of Liberty," signed W. ? I replied L. B. Wilkes, one of the editors of the *Apostolic Times*, Lexington, Ky. "Ah, these are very sound articles to come from brethren in America ! Now, I know it has been the custom of the *British Harbinger* to reprint writings from American papers, and I think it is well to do so if acknowledgment is made whence they come. If the B. H. instead of putting W., G., H., L., or M., after articles copied from the *Apostolic Times*, would give the full name of the writers, viz. : Wilkes, Graham, Hopson, Lord, McGarvey, or simply say: *From Apostolic Times*, it would tend to remove the impression that all the American brethren are to be suspected, and would establish many a heart in confidence, as well as do justice to those brethren in America whose sound soul-stirring articles enrich the pages of the *British Harbinger*.

Our prayer is that we may all labour to keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace.

Fraternally,

O. A. CARR.

REMARKS.

We are in doubt as to the intentions of the writer of the foregoing. In view of his writing only on one side of the paper, and from the general contents we think he intended publication ; yet, from the introductory clause, there is some little room to doubt. As it would require five months to ascertain, and as we conclude it most likely that publicity was intended it thus appears.

Of course we rejoice at the progress in Australia. We are glad that brethren can do there what they could not do here. Here the ground is pre-occupied, but there is a vast clearing going on and we believe a better time is at hand.

In regard to articles, re-printed from American periodicals, we give the names in full or the initial letters only as they appear in the papers from which they are taken. Sometimes we name the paper and at others not. The like holds good in papers which re-print from our pages. It might, perhaps, be as well if there were a uniform practice on both sides, and the names were always given.

Br. Carr writes like a true man

concerning the kind of preachers they want and will stand by. We have no fear at all about the reception which will be given to any Evangelist from America or from England, if he be one who will stand squarely to the good old ways. There is an amount of prejudice against preachers from the old country and from the United States, which Br. Carr considers has been caused by our letters to the disciples of Christ in America, in which, he intimates, we "undertook to set in order things in America." This is quite a mistake. We never had the most remote idea that we were called to set things in order in America ; nor did we suppose that such a work could be accomplished by a few letters. What we undertook was the task of informing brethren in America as to the state of the churches in this country, and to point out wherein some of the American churches differ from us. That we instanced "special aberrations from the *old paths*" is true, but no one is justified in concluding from our letters that "all the American brethren are going askew." Not only did our words imply nothing of the sort, but we said, over and over again, in those very letters, that such is not the case—that the bulk of the brotherhood is sound ; that leading preachers, editors, and writers stand with us in condemning such aberrations ; and we have said nothing in describing said evils, nor in condemning them, stronger than those good and true brethren in America have said and are still saying. Our letters were *particularly* guarded on this point—so much so as to render it impossible for one who pays any attention to what he reads to misunderstand them. The fact of the writing of these letters still gives us the fullest satisfaction. Not one of them would we re-call, or consign to forgetfulness. In America a half-dozen persons have laid on to us, but they are of the class who most needed them, and whose diverging

tendencies are apparent. The approbation of that class we did not expect nor desire; but from men, than whom none stand higher with the brotherhood generally, we have ardent thanks and testimony to the good service rendered by our epistles.

If the Australian brethren are "*prejudiced*" against preachers from this country and America, we regret it; but there was nothing in our letters to gender prejudice. They contain no loose, general, indefinite statements. Evils are clearly *specified*; and that they exist, not generally, but only to a given extent (which extent is moderately described), is affirmed. The simple truth is stated in a guarded manner, and the tendency of truths, thus presented, is not to produce prejudice, but to destroy it; more particularly so when there is also published what is said on the other side, which we have done by giving the replies to our epistles published in America.

Perhaps *caution* would have been a better word to describe the effect of our letters than the word *prejudice*. If the brethren in Australia are led to exercise caution in the matter of sending for and receiving Evangelists, in consequence of reading our epistles, we shall then have placed them under considerable obligation to the writer; for there is room for caution and much need to exercise it. See the article on the Clergy Society imme-

diately preceding this, and it is at once seen that without caution you may import a mere clergyman, and one unfit for the work you desire to commit to the hands of a faithful Evangelist. Caution, then, is *good* and *wise*; prejudice against Evangelists, simply because they come from America, is *bad* and *absurd*.

Again we intimate—as again and again we did in said letters—that whatever there is of clericalism or other aberration among the churches in America, there is no room to suppose that the evil prevails there more than it will do in Australia and here when our prosperity, in regard to numbers, is equal. A certain percentage of this kind of thing may be looked for everywhere in the day of large success. Our business is to watch against it, beat it down, and rouse others to caution. The wrongdoers will cry out, seek to throw us upon a wrong scent, charge us with insulting their nationality, or some such nonsense. But let us not be turned aside. Our part is to cry aloud and spare not.

God bless Br. Carr in the noble work to which he and Br. Surber and others have put their hands. The Lord bless them, and all the young whom they can influence to give themselves to the work, and may mighty success be reported from the far-off land.

Ed.

THE CENSUS—HOW SHALL THE CHURCH BE DESIGNATED?

I HAVE been very well pleased with the article with the above caption in the June Harbinger, but I think there is good reason for not adopting the name "*Church of God*," in the census returns next year.

The numerical method of investigation, is undoubtedly the only one to arrive at a correct knowledge of any subject, the evidence of which is or can be cumulative, and

E. Evans's induction, seems to be complete. How then shall we set aside his conclusion, which appears also to be that of the Editor? We shall see.

If our induction is to be a correct one, it will not suffice that we have merely all the occurrences of the phrases we are discussing, but our *classification* must also be exact. It is to no purpose to say that one

phrase is used twenty times, and another but once, if they are used in different circumstances, and that difference be not noted; and there is great difference between the usage of the term *Christian*, and the term "*Church of God*," as given in the passages referred to by E. Evans.

The object of our inquiry is by what name we are willing—not to call ourselves, but to be called by others; and in New Testament usage, the name used by outsiders is never "*Church of God*." This is the family name in which we delight. It is the one that tells us of the love of the Great Father. We are His *ecclesiu*, His *kleros*. But this is not the name that outsiders would recognise, and if we wish them to do so, it is merely a vain wish.

On the other hand, that other "worthy name by which ye are called," is equally dear to us, and it is the one that outsiders can and do recognise. It is the one by which we come to the Father, and the one which in our prayers is ever present, and that by which at Antioch, the children of God were designated by the theistic Jew, and polytheistic Gentile. It is the name in which, and for which, we are called to suffer. (1 Peter, iv. 16.) This is the name which the disciple vaunts before the world, the one of which he sings he is not ashamed, and the one of which sect-makers, and sectarians are less enamoured than of some others. I would ask the brethren to look again carefully over all the passages cited by E. E., and they will find none in which "*Church of God*," (or Churches) is used as a name by externs. On the other hand, the name of *Christ*, and the designation *Christian*, are the only appellations used by the outsiders with the decided sanction of the apostles; so that we are shut up to the choice of the word *Christian*, or the phrase "*Church of Christ*" (or Churches).

There is a curious illustration in the article of E. E. of the superiority

of the last form of speech, as a denominational name, in the fact that every time he wishes to speak of the Churches of the disciples, he uses it; thus. "If the Churches of Christ will return," &c. (p. 204). Whether *Church of Christ*, or *Christian*, be the better form for the census return, will depend on the form of the question, or heading of the column in the return. Thus: if it be required to state "to what religious denomination do you belong," then Church of Christ will be the answer, but if "religious profession," be the question, then *Christian* will be the true return.

Now, I am sure that E. E. will be convinced that I am right, and I hope he will write another article in the August *Harbinger* and say so; and if the brethren will, as churches, look at the question, they will be able to send the result of their investigations to the annual meeting, so that we may have unanimity on the matter

R. HAY.

REMARKS.

Whether the writer of the foregoing is really serious we cannot say. To us it reads as though it were written by one disposed to illustrate the hopelessness of attempting any refutation of the plea put in by E. E., for the designation, "*Church of God*."

R. H. mistakes the object entirely, when he intimates that it is not to determine the name by which we will call ourselves, but to find a designation which others will be pleased to apply to us. But were R. H., correct in this respect, we should not dispose to reject, "*Church of God*," in favour of "*Church of Christ*," or "*Christian Church*," because we are certain that outsiders are quite as likely to designate us by the first named, as by either of the others, and there is no reason why they should not. If we select one of our most active and honoured brethren, and put to the end of that name I. T. E., they will consent so to call

us, but they will no more accept, as our proper designation either of the terms proposed by R. H., than they will that urged upon us by E. E.

If we are of the Church which was planted by the Apostles our course is to designate ourselves, individually and collectively, as that Church was designated by those to whom the Lord gave authority. We are not to select, for exclusive use, one of the names so applied, but to bear and own them all. "Church of God," then must of necessity, be most frequently used, if we are content not to set about mending the good old ways of the Apostles. We shall not object to "Church of Christ," as an additional designation in common speech, but in government returns, one name only *must* be given, otherwise we shall appear as two or more distinct bodies. That one name, we agree to should be the one chiefly used in Holy Scripture: which is "Church of God." If the other form be required, and we have to state what we are individually, then "Christians" is the proper designation. If

"externs" will not call us as we designate ourselves, and as those who are in Christ are designated by the Holy Spirit, we must leave that to them. It is not our business to find names to please them, nor need we answer when they call us by names of their own devising.

R. H. says that if we select "Church of God," they will not apply it to us. But the question relates to the name we adopt for the census and other government returns, and here we beg to say, the government has no choice but to receive our returns and adopt our designation. For general use it is not proposed to confine us to the one term, to the exclusion of the other, and therefore, "outsiders" can have their choice; but we know that they will take neither the one nor the other, but designate us after the *fashion* in which they name themselves—that is by some *ite* or *ism*. But with this we have no present concern, nor is it of much consequence. Ed.

REVISION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

At the first meeting of the committee appointed by the Convocation of Canterbury, May 6, 1870, the following resolutions and rules were agreed to, as the fundamental principles on which the revision is to be conducted:—

I. That the Committee appointed by the Convocation of Canterbury at its last Session separate itself into two companies, the one for the revision of the authorized version of the Old Testament, the other for the revision of the authorized version of the New Testament.

II. That the company for the revision of the authorized version of the Old Testament consist of the Bishops of St. Davids, Llandaff, Ely, Lincoln, and Bath and Wells, and of the following members from the Lower House:—Archdeacon Rose, Canon Selwyn, Dr. Jebb, and Dr. Kay.

III. That the Company for the revision of the authorized version of the New Testament consist of the Bishops of Win-

chester, Gloucester and Bristol, and Salisbury, and of the following members from the Lower House:—The Prolocutor, the Deans of Canterbury, and Westminster, and Canon Blakesley.

IV. That the first portion of the work to be undertaken by the Old Testament Company be the revision of the authorized version of the Pentateuch.

V. That the first portion of the work to be undertaken by the New Testament Company be the revision of the authorized version of the Synoptical Gospels.

VI. That the following scholars and divines be invited to join the Old Testament Company:—Dr. W. L. Alexander, Professor Chinnery, Canon Cook, Professor A. B. Davidson, Dr. B. Davies, Professor Fairbairn, the Rev. F. Field, Dr. Ginsburg, Dr. Gotch, Archdeacon Harrison, Professor Leathes, Professor M'Gill, Canon Payne Smith, Professor E. H. Perowne, Professor Plumptre, Canon Pusey, Dr. Wright (British Museum), W. A. Wright (Cambridge).

VII. That the following scholars and divines be invited to join the New Testament Company :—Dr. Angus, the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Eadie, the Rev. F. J. A. Hort, the Rev. W. G. Humphry, Canon Kennedy, Archdeacon Lee, Dr. Lightfoot, Professor Milligan, Professor Moulton, Dr. J. H. Newman, Professor Newth, Dr. A. Roberts, the Rev. G. Vance Smith, Dr. Scott (Balliol College), the Rev. F. Scrivener, Dr. Vaughan, and Canon Westcott.

VIII. That the general principles to be followed by both companies be as follows :—

1. To introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the authorized version consistently with faithfulness.

2. To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the authorized and earlier English versions.

3. Each company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally, and on principles of voting as hereinafter is provided.

4. That the text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating, and that when the text so adopted differs from that from which the authorized version was made the alteration be indicated in the margin.

5. To make or retain no change in the text on the second final revision by each company, except two-thirds of those present approve of the same, but on the first revision to decide by simple majorities.

6. In every case of proposed alteration that may have given rise to discussion, to defer the voting thereupon till the next meeting, whensoever the same shall be required by one-third of those present at the meeting, such intended vote to be announced in the notice for the next meeting.

7. To revise the headings of chapters, pages, paragraphs, italics and punctuation.

8. To refer, on the part of each company, when considered desirable, to divines, scholars, and literary men, whether at home or abroad, for their opinions.

IX. That the work of each company be communicated to the other as it is completed, in order that there may be as little deviation from uniformity in language as possible.

X. That the special or bye-rules for each company be as follows :—

1. To make all corrections in writing previous to the meeting.

2. To place all the corrections due to textual considerations on the left-hand margin, and all other corrections on the right-hand margin.

3. To transmit to the chairman, in case of being unable to attend, the corrections proposed in the portion agreed upon for consideration.

Thus Independents, Baptists, Methodists and others are allied with State Church men in the work. Several of the Revisors named have declined, on the score of want of health, time, &c. Others, will no doubt, be added, as each company is to go over the work twice. We wish to submit to the proper parties a recommendation that the first revision be published for general criticism and suggestions before the final revision. We shall hope to bring this under the notice of the proper parties.

The resolutions are given here, though many of our readers have seen them, because it is desirable to have the history of this work upon our pages. Subsequent stages will be reported, in like manner. *Ed.*

THE ANNUAL MEETING RETURNS.

A few suggestions are offered, in order to facilitate the business at our Annual gathering. Referring to the Schedules for some years past it will be found that the returns have been sent in a very defective state. There is always great anxiety to ascertain the gain of members during the year; hitherto much time has been expended, with very unsatisfactory results. The following simple plan, if adhered to, will materially promote

this desirable end. The number of members of the last year added to the first four columns of the Schedule (see Report of Annual Meetings) will account for all members who have been received into, or belonged to the church during the past year—then the remaining members added to the present return of members will balance.

Now last year, in a number of cases, the total of members, after

adding those columns which indicate additions, and deducting those which show removals did not agree with the number returned the previous year. Of course, in all such cases the Schedules are incorrectly filled, and misleading. It is requisite for every church sending in returns to see that the sum-total balances with that of the previous year.

If the Schedules are correctly made out, according to this plan, much time will be saved. A statement from the returns sent in could be previously prepared and presented after the reading of the letters.

In the case of churches which made no returns last year, but intend to do so this, the number of members can be given for 1869. New churches

should give the number who first met, under the head of "Received from Sister Churches," or "having been formerly immersed," this, with the additions and subtractions, would not disturb the general balance.

Inconvenience is occasionally experienced for want of a proper room for the Secretaries to prepare the work. This has sometimes to be done at an hotel, where no room can be had for such a purpose. If a Secretary's room could be provided it would greatly facilitate the proper preparation of the work.

This, if attended to, will carry out the Apostle Paul's injunction. "Let every thing be done decently and in order."

E. FRASER.

H. S. EARL'S LETTER.

WHETHER justice to H. S. Earl, or the good of any person, requires the insertion of more of his letter than has appeared has been submitted to the General Evangelist Committee. The Secretary on behalf of the Committee, writes, that they are

strongly of opinion that more should not be published.

The *American Christian Review*, to which it was sent, declines to insert it.

Ed.

ITEMS OF NEWS.

NEWTON, JASPER COUNTY.

DEAR BRO. KING, enclosed I send you payment for the *Harbinger*. The good work is progressing in this Country. We held a Meeting of twenty-three days in this place, in March, and had more than twenty additions to the Church. A few miles from here the brethren held a Meeting at the same time, with seventy-three additions. In the hope of Eternal Life.

W. BROTHERS.

WHITEHAVEN.—The following is from one of the local Newspapers.—"RE-OPENING OF GORE'S-BUILDINGS CHAPEL.—This chapel, having been closed for repairs and the erection of a vestry, &c., was re-opened on Sunday last, for the use of the Christian Church, till then meeting in the Temperance Hall. In the morning the service was of a somewhat open kind, consisting of prayer, praise, the Lord's Supper, and teaching, which was announced as open to all members able to edify. In the Afternoon and evening, Mr. David King, of Birmingham, editor of the *British Harbinger*, preached. The attendance was good, and

in the evening the vestry had to be used to accommodate those who could not find seats in the chapel. Mr. King is announced to preach again next Sunday afternoon and evening. On Monday there was a tea meeting, when the tables were well filled. After tea addresses were delivered by Messrs. W. Barr, of Kirby, and G. Collinge, of Carlisle; and by Mr. King, who set forth that there are now three vast forces contending for victory in Europe and America—Romanism, Protestantism and Rationalism. He argued that Romanism must hasten to decay; that Protestantism, to make any large inroad upon the masses, must (as it certainly will) put an end to its denominationalism and become one compact body, as in the Apostolic time; and that this change and success will certainly be realised to the discomfort of the Papacy and infidelity. Last (Wednesday) evening Mr. King, delivered an interesting lecture at the Temperance Hall, on "Secularism, its moral basis, and immoral results."

On the following Lord's Day, D. King delivered three discourses in the chapel; in which several interesting meetings were

held during the week. One other lecture was also delivered in the Temperance Hall. Considerable interest was manifested, as also much regret, that the visit and efforts of D. K. could not be continued. The chapel has been till now occupied by a very small company, who have now fully accepted the original order. Uniting with the Church, in the Temperance Hall, the two communions have become one. The chapel has been repaired, and a vestry erected, at a cost of perhaps £150, and will now conveniently answer the purposes of the Church.

BOLTON, May 9.—Since the church removed to the Baths, we have had many good and profitable Meetings. Our hearts were gladdened on Wednesday evening, by seeing one buried with Jesus, by baptism. May he be faithful to death.

J. SIMS.

Two have lately been immersed in Barker Gate, Nottingham, and joined the Church, all living in peace and love.

May 25.

T. W.

Obituary.

At Liverpool, on the 27th April, ELLEN McLAUGHLIN, aged 55 years. She was immersed about two years ago by Bro. Strang, has since been confined very much to the house through continued sickness and infirmity. She died in assured union with Christ, and in the hope of immortality.

On the 12th May, ANDREW CALDER, aged 30 years, a dear brother, in whose deep piety

and purity of life the Church had great comfort. Though of retiring disposition, his influence was always felt to be sweet and powerful for good. He has left a widow and two children.

On the 20th May, JAMES JONES, aged 76 years, a veteran soldier both of Christ and his country. His early years were spent in the Army, and he brought all his soldierly instincts of recruit drill and discipline into the service of Christ. He was untiring in his desire to enlist soldiers in the army of the saved, always delighted with the progress of young disciples, in the power to do the Lord's work. As a Christian, he knew no higher, no other law for himself and others than the clearly expressed word of command from head quarters, and the duty of implicit unquestioning obedience. He had long suffered from a bronchial affection, but succumbed at last very suddenly to its prostrating effects. We feel the void of these repeated bereavements, but the hope of re-union in the better land should sustain our drooping hearts. Sweet the communion of saints, and sweet the hope that souls thus prepared, and gone before await our arrival, and shall welcome us to that blissful shore, where

"Sighs ne'er float o'er life's pure river,
And tears are wiped away for ever."

G. Y. T.

Departed this life May 27, in the 59th year of his age, THOS. WILKINSON, of Stockport; having been a consistent member of the Church for 28 years. T. H.

SARAH FLETCHER, of BARNBURY, fell asleep in Jesus, May 25, 1870, aged 63 years.

The Family Room.

WHAT WILL THEY SAY ?

MR WHAT-WILL-THEY-SAY.—There is no greater tyrant under the sun than that "Mr. What-will-they say," and no despot ever held his subjects in more slavish fear than does he. The man who bows to this tyrant is no longer his own master; he is swayed to and fro against his better judgment, and led into difficulties and troubles which rob him of all peace of mind, and embitter his whole life. Go through the streets of every town, and the houses of every street, and how many families will you find who are not harassed

by this ancient gentleman? Very few indeed, comparatively. I call him "gentleman" for courtesy's sake; but I call him "ancient" advisedly, for he is of such great age that it would be impossible to determine when he came into existence. I am fain to believe that he flourished in the time of the patriarchs, and survived the flood; but unlike those men of old, he has never given the recorder the opportunity of noting concerning him the solemn fact, "And he died;" for this old fellow is now as hale and as vigorous as ever he was

in the old, old times; and there is every probability of his existing to the very end of the world, and, moreover, of his retaining his irresistible ruling power all the time. You may think *you* have never bowed to him, but indeed you are mistaken! It may safely be said that there is not a man or woman in Christendom who has not slavishly bowed down to him at some time or other of their lives—actually put their necks under his foot and owned his sway. But some having done this once or twice, and smarted under his iron heel, have thereupon cast off his sway, and risen up independent men and women, strong-minded enough to brave and defy him evermore. But while crying out against him thus vehemently, I must do him the justice to say that it is people's own fault that he tyrannizes over them. Were he kept within proper

bounds, he would not be the curse to society that he is: indeed, he might be made quite a blessing; for he could be used to regulate the conduct of those people who are devoid of that best of regulators—a good conscience. It is nothing but right that everybody should recognise his existence so far as to give him a nod on certain occasions, just sufficient to stop his mouth when he is eager to cast slurs upon those who are devoted to the right; for sometimes the non-recognition of him might give cause—groundless, no doubt, but still cause—to the enemy to rejoice. If we bear in mind the Scriptural exhortation, “Abstain from the very appearance of evil,” we shall certainly recognise the existence of “Mr. What-will-they-say,” but without bending to his rule. “I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say.”—*The Quiver*.

“I HAVE ONLY LOST ONE.”

THE following touching story has been forwarded to us for publication by the Rev. O. Faulkner, English chaplain at Roubaix:—

One night, some time ago, a French police agent found a boy in an open stall in the street, and, rousing him up, took him to the station. On the following morning he was taken before the magistrate, and charged with vagrancy.

When placed in the dock, the magistrate asked his name, age, and trade. He said his name was Jacques Wynsberghe, that he was fourteen years old, and that his trade was to sell oranges in the streets for the women who keep stalls in the market.

Magistrate: But you were found last night in an open stall, asleep; how do you explain that?—Yes, sir, it is true; I had nowhere else to lodge, and two of my companions showed me the place.

Magistrate: Then have you no home?—No, sir.

Magistrate: What do your parents do?—They have been a long time dead.

Magistrate: And have you no one to care for you?—Oh yes! there is my eldest sister. Come, Marie, come and speak for me. At these words a young woman came forward, pale and trembling. She held a little girl by the hand. Both were neatly, cleanly, but very simply dressed, and both were weeping bitterly. There was nothing prepossessing in her appearance till her story was told.

In answer to the magistrate, she said her name was Marie Wynsberghe, that she was twenty-five years of age, and that she was a waistcoat maker.

Magistrate: This boy, then, is your brother?—Yes sir, alas, yes,

Magistrate: Then why do you allow him to run about the streets, and lead this vagabond life?—Oh, sir, do not scold me; it is not my fault, I assure you it is not. And her tears prevented her from speaking.

Magistrate: I have no wish to scold you needlessly.—No, sir, I believe not; and you would not, if you knew all. We came from Belgium to France ten years ago. We were seven children, and father earned good wages, and we were very comfortable. But father and mother both died, and we were left alone. I was just about to be married to an honest young man from my own country, but when we were left I felt that that could not be. I said to him, “Leave me in peace. Here are six children that God has given me to care for; I must be their mother. When they have all made their first communion, and have learned a trade, then, if you still wish to marry me, come again—you will find me here.” She paused for a moment, and the magistrate spoke kindly to her, begging her to finish her story. I worked hard, and

God gave me success. They have all been apprenticed except this little one (looking at the girl by her side), and she will make her first communion this year. They have all done well, very well, except Jacques (looking at the prisoner); he has never been willing to work.

Magistrate: But how is it that you should have given him such a trade as that of orange-seller?—Oh, sir, not at all—I did nothing of the kind; I put him to the lace trade, with a very decent man.

Do you hear, Jacques, said the magistrate your sister gave you a good trade; why have you left your master?—Because he was always beating me.—Oh, Jacques, said his sister, you should not say that; he only punished you when you robbed him and told him lies, and you know how it troubles me to see you here.—Will you, asked the magistrate, take him home and try to reclaim him?—I would gladly do it, sir, but I dare not. I have five others at

home, who all behave so well, and he may spoil them. Since he took to bad ways, and has been in prison, I cannot sleep—I am sore troubled. What shall I do? May be you will tell me what you think I ought to do.

Magistrate: We cannot advise you—you know best; but whatever you decide to do, we do, and shall think most highly of you.—Well, then, I will not take him back; and I will tell God, who gave them to me, that I have only lost one.

The magistrate said he was of opinion that she was acting for the best, and it was decided that Jacques should not be sent to prison, but to a reformatory, till he was eighteen years of age.

Looking at him before he left the dock—it may be with the hope that perhaps after all she had not lost one—she said: Listen, Jacques, try to be a good boy, and then you will come back to me and the others.

Christian Times.

THE BIBLE TRIUMPHANT.

It is a matter of congratulation that the Bible has passed triumphantly through the ordeal of verbal criticism. English infidels of the last century raised a premature pæan over the discovery and publication of so many various readings. They imagined that the popular mind would be rudely and thoroughly shaken, that Christianity would be placed in imminent peril of extinction, and that the Church would be dispersed, and ashamed of the sight of its Magna Charta. But the result has blasted all their hopes, and the oracles of God are found to have been preserved in immaculate integrity.

The storm that shakes the oak only loosens the earth around its roots, and its violence enables the tree to strike its roots deeper in the soil.

So it is that Scripture has gloriously surmounted every trial. There gathers around the Bible a dense "cloud of witnesses," from the ruins of Nineveh and the valley of the Nile; from the slabs and bass-reliefs of Sennacherib, and tombs and monuments of Pharaoh; from rolls of Chaldee paraphrast, and Syrian

version; from the cells and libraries of monastic scribes, and the dry and dusty labors of scholars and antiquarians.

Our present Bible is undiluted by the lapse of ages. Her oracles, written amid such strange diversity of time, place and condition—among the sands and cliffs of Arabia, the fields and hills of Palestine—in the prison cell and the lonely isle—have descended to us in unimpaired fullness and accuracy, so that we are placed as advantageously toward them as the generation which hung on the lips of Jesus, as he recited a parable on the shores of a Galilean lake, or those churches which received from Paul or Peter one of their epistles of warning exposition.

Yes, the river of life, which issues out from beneath the throne of God and the Lamb, may, as it flows through so many countries, sometimes bear with it the earthly evidences of its conquests; but the great volume of its waters has neither been diminished nor dimmed in its transparency, nor bereft of its healing virtue.

THE CHRISTIAN'S HOPE.

Dr. Richardson, in the second volume of the *Memoirs of A. Campbell*, gives an interesting anecdote of Robert Owen, the moral of which is valuable. Mr. Owen visited Mr. Campbell at Bethany, to make arrangements for their approaching discussion on "The Evidences of Christianity." "In one of their excursions about the Farm, they came to Mr. Campbell's family burying-ground, when Mr. Owen stopped, and addressing himself to Mr. C. said: 'There is one advantage I have over the Christian—I

am not afraid to die. Most Christians have fear in death; but if a few items of my business were settled, I should be perfectly willing to die at any moment.' 'Well,' answered Mr. Campbell, 'you say you have no fear in death, have you any hope in death?' After a solemn pause, 'No,' said Mr. Owen. 'Then,' rejoined Mr. Campbell (pointing to an ox standing near), 'you are on a level with that brute. He has fed until he is satisfied, and stands in the shade whisking off the flies, and has *neither hope nor fear in death.*'"

SEASONABLE REPROOF.

A YOUNG lady turned from her toilet, and saw her gaily-attired sisters in haste to be on their way to the intended party. "Ma," said she, impatient to hear her mother pronounce some expression of admiration for her symmetrical form, as she had once unguardedly done, "Ma, do we not remind you of that beautiful group of little butterflies we saw at the pond?"

"Why, daughter," replied the mother, "I confess there is some similarity in the varied colors of your dress. The butterfly, my dear, though beautiful in her appearance, is far from being the most intelligent and exalted of her class of insects. Her movements, you perceive, are directed wholly by caprice, as she flits hither and thither, without end or aim. And we must condemn her want of delicacy in taste, as we see her sip with avidity from stagnant ponds, when she is endued with the power to rise and drink the sweets from every spring flower, and soar far above her sister insects. Besides, my child, there are those who entertain but little respect for our sex, that have but too successfully made the disparaging comparison between us and the butterfly; for there is a class, it is true, who are ever hastening to and fro, without the view of benefiting themselves or others, who may be justly compared to these

pretty silly creatures. But I flatter myself that my daughters, by a proper use of their time, shall deserve to be classed among a more intelligent and useful order of beings."

These well-timed remarks made a salutary impression upon the ingenuous mind of young Caroline. From that evening she was seldom seen abroad, unless where duty called, or for mere relaxation from her close application to study, and domestic duties. Her mind soon became stored with useful knowledge, and her society was courted as a valuable acquisition to the social circle.

The mother lived when time had stolen the rosy tint from the cheek of her Caroline, and the youthful sparkle of the eye had given place to the milder beam kindled by the illumination of the mind. The rich harvest of virtues repaid the seed sown in due season; for she realized in her daughter all the excellencies which her most sanguine hopes had anticipated.

Thus, by a sensible and good-natured reproof, might many a thoughtless daughter be reclaimed from a prodigal waste of time, and her mind directed to the pursuit of such objects as could not fail to secure her a rank among the most exalted creatures of intellect. "A word spoken in season, how good is it!"

M. FORSHEY.

RELIGIONS—THEIR TENDENCY TO DECAY.

I have recently added to my library a most excellent work in two volumes, entitled "Chips from a German Workshop," by Max Muller, M. A., Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford, England. I have read these volumes with edification and pleasure. The author is perhaps inferior to no living man in profound scholarship, and in varied and extensive learning. Especially is he distinguished for his intimate acquaintance with Oriental language, literature and religion. This great linguist and literarian devotes his great mind, in all his studies and researches after truth, to the defence of the Bible, as the book of inspiration, and to the advocacy of the religion of the Christ, as the pure, true, and now only divinely-authorized religion. In his preface he advises ministers of the gospel to study profoundly all the religions of the world, that from a thorough examination of the foundations of all, they may ascertain the true and "immense difference" between our own and all other religions of the world. He notices the striking fact that "the position which believers and unbelievers occupy to their various forms of faith, is very much the same all over the world. So also the great problems touching the finite and the infinite, the human and the divine that interest us and the difficulties that trouble us, have interested and troubled the minds and hearts of men "as far back as we can trace the beginnings of religious life." By acquainting ourselves with these matters as they relate to the religious life of the world, the author most beautifully says, "He shall know the rocks that threaten every religion in this changing and shifting world of ours, and having watched many a storm of religious controversy, and many a shipwreck in distant seas, we shall face with greater calmness and prudence the troubled waters at home." But my main object in this paper is to direct attention to a statement of Mr. Muller, in regard to the decline that seems to characterize all religions, in the course of time, a decline seemingly inevitable from their contact with the world. He says, preface, pp. 22 and 23: "If there is one thing which a comparative study of religions places in the clearest light, it is the inevitable decay to which every religion is exposed. It may seem almost like a truism, that no religion can continue to be what it was during the lifetime of its founder and its first apostles. Yet, it is but seldom borne in mind that without constant reformation, *i. e.*, without a constant return to its fountain head, every religion, even the most perfect, nay, the most perfect on account of its very perfection, more even than others, suffers from its contact with the world as the purest air suffers from the fact of its being breathed." "Whenever we can trace back a religion to its first beginnings, we find it free from many of the blemishes that offend us in its later phases. As soon as a religion is established, and more particularly when it has become the religion of a powerful State, the foreign and worldly elements encroach more and more on the original foundation, and human interests mar the simplicity and purity of the plan which the founder had conceived in his own heart, and matured in his communings with God. Even those who lived with Buddha misunderstood his words, and at the great council which had to settle the Buddhist canon, Asoka, the Indian Constantine, had to remind the assembled priests that 'what had been said by Buddha, that alone was well said;' and that certain works ascribed to Buddha, as, for instance, the instruction given to his son Rahula, were apocryphal, if not heretical." My readers will pardon me for the

following quite lengthy but deeply interesting quotation from the preface—a quotation in immediate connection with the above:

“With every century, Buddhism, when it was accepted by nations, differing as widely as Mongols and Hindus, when its sacred writings were translated into languages as wide apart as Sanscrit and Chinese, assumed widely different aspects, till at last the Buddhism of the Shamans in the Steppes of Tartary is as different from the teaching of the original Samana as the Christianity of the leader of the Chinese rebels is from the teaching of Christ. If missionaries could show to the Brahmins, the Buddhists, the Zoroastrians, nay, even to the Mohammedans, how much their present faith differs from the faith of their forefathers and founders; if they could place in their hands and read with them in a kindly spirit the original documents on which these various religions profess to be founded, and enable them to distinguish between the doctrines of their own sacred books and the addition of later ages, an important advantage would be gained, and the choice between Christ and other masters would be rendered far more easy to many a truth seeking soul. But for that purpose it is necessary that we too should see the beam in our own eyes and learn to distinguish between the Christianity of the nineteenth century and the religion of Christ. If we find that the Christianity of the nineteenth century does not win as many hearts in India and China as it ought, let us remember that it was the Christianity of the first century in its dogmatic simplicity, but with its overpowering love of God and man, that conquered the world and superseded religions and philosophies, more difficult to conquer than the religious and philosophical systems of Hindus and Buddhists. If we can teach something to the Brahmins in reading with them their sacred hymns, they too can teach us something when reading with us the gospel of Christ. Never shall I forget the deep despondency of a Hindu convert, a real martyr to his faith, who had pictured to himself from the pages of the New Testament what a Christian country must be, and who, when he came to Europe, found everything so different from what he had imagined in his lonely meditations at Benares. It was the Bible only that saved him from returning to his old religion, and helped him to discern beneath theological futilities, accumulated during nearly two thousand years, beneath pharisaical hypocrisy, infidelity, and want of charity, the buried but still living seed committed to the earth by Christ and his apostles. How can a missionary in such circumstances meet the surprise and questions of his pupils unless he may point to that seed and tell them what Christianity was meant to be; unless he may show that, like all other religions, Christianity, too, has had its history; that the Christianity of the nineteenth century is not the Christianity of the middle ages; that the Christianity of the middle ages was not that of the early councils; that the Christianity of the early councils was not that of the apostles, and ‘that what was said by Christ that alone was well said.’”

Mr. Muller belongs to the Established Church of England. What valuable testimony there is in the utterances of such a man, sustaining the importance, the necessity and propriety of the reformatory movement of this century. The Campbells, Stones, Scotts, Smiths, were actuated by motives as high and pure as ever burned in the bosom of regenerated humanity. They saw the “inevitable decay” that had come upon “the most perfect” of all the religions of earth, that “the truth as it is in Jesus,” the good seed of the gospel had long lain buried “beneath theological futilities, pharisaical hypocrisy, and infidelity,” “that the Christianity of the nineteenth century was not that of Christ and the apostles,” that

"foreign and worldly elements had encroached more and more on the original foundation" of our holy religion, and that "human interests had marred the simplicity and purity of the plan which the founder had conceived in his own heart," had committed to his apostles, and through them communicated to the world. Deeply grieved at the apostacy all around them, earnestly, anxiously and prayerfully they sought a remedy.—They found it in a "reformation; i. e., a constant return to the fountain head"—in retracing their steps away from all "theological utilities," back to the "dogmatic simplicity" of primitive Christianity—away from the "additions of later ages" to the teachings of their sacred books, back to the "original documents" on which the Christian religion was founded, and away from all human authority in religion, back to the status of simple Disciples of Christ, sitting at the feet of Christ and his inspired apostles, to learn of them, and of them alone, the science of religion, the knowledge that maketh wise to salvation and the way of holiness, of peace, and of eternal life. We who have reaped where these great men have sowed, at this particular juncture of affairs religiously, should ponder well the words of Max Muller. In the lapse of years, in any given decade perhaps, we should inaugurate a "constant return to the fountain head" of authority and truth. We should carefully guard against the encroachments upon the original foundation of "worldly influence and human interests." We should be careful to preserve the "dogmatic simplicity" of the Apostles in doctrine, and the simplicity also of the apostolic churches in worship.

And let us seek to learn this primitive simplicity of doctrine and practice from the Bible alone, "the original documents" on which our religion is founded. At the risk of being charged with a "platitude," let me quote, in conclusion, from the Apostle Paul: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished for every good work."

H.

Apostolic Times.

BAPTIZO IN THE HELLENISTIC, OR NEW TESTAMENT DIALECT.*

In the controversy about the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo*, it has often occurred, and doubtless will yet often occur, that the advocates of pouring and sprinkling, when driven from their ground by the obvious and invariable classic meaning of *baptizo*,—to immerse, have recourse, as a last resort, to the plea that as the Greek language passed, from the classic to the Hellenistic dialect, through changes which effected the meaning of words,—the signification of a word in classic Greek is no rule for its signification in the Hellenistic dialect of the New Testament period; and that, furthermore, this dialect as represented in the New Testament, has there again peculiarities of its own; still further affecting the meaning of words, so that classic usage is still less a law for the New Testament Greek. Over and over again, with a show of learning often, are the changes rung on this argument, and that especially before audiences altogether incompetent to judge of the truth or falsity of the facts adduced.

There is in this argument based on the peculiarities of the Hellenistic and New Testament dialect, a very disingenuous and shallow sophistry.

* This excellent article, from the *Millennial Harbinger*, is commended as worthy immediately to follow the "Relation of Baptism and the Remission of Sins," given in our last two issues.—Ed.

First, with much show of learning,—quite cheap, the historic fact is exhibited, in exaggerated form, that the Greek language, from the classic to the Hellenistic period, did pass, in its written and spoken forms, through lexical and grammatical changes. It is then shown that these changes are found in the New Testament Greek, with certain peculiarities of its own. Then under cover of these facts, that in their proper, true bounds nobody denies, a general mist is thrown over the meaning of words, and so *baptizo* is rescued, for the peculiar benefit of pedobaptists, from its proper classic meaning. This is sophistry;—the legitimate course on the part of the pedobaptist, should be, to show that the changes from classic to Hellenistic Greek affected *baptizo* at all—for it was only within certain limits that the meaning of words was affected; and then it is further incumbent on him to show, that this influence on *baptizo* was so great as to change it from its primary, exclusive meaning,—to *immerse*, so as to comprehend also to *pour* and to *sprinkle*, or the latter two only, to the entire abandonment of its original signification.

We propose in a brief and direct way, to look at this question. And first, a few words in general, on the New Testament diction.

In the time of Alexander the Great and his successors, in consequence of their wars, by the general mingling together of all parts of the Greek-speaking peoples, and also the general considerable decline of Greek classic literature, in the place of the pure Attic which had become the predominant form of classic Greek, a general, popular language was gradually formed, of a lower type, constituted of a melting together, so to speak, of the various hitherto separately existing dialects, which contained in it that which was common to all these dialects, as well as elements peculiar to each. This *common or Hellenistic dialect*, in its best form, of course, was *the language as written*, in its lower form, *the language as spoken*. As such, in both forms, it became the speech of the peoples lying round the eastern part of the Mediterranean; the medium of common intercourse among these, it was the effect of the dominion of the Macedonian conquerors over these nations. In addition to this *common or Hellenic* speech, each particular nation also, mingled with it, naturally, when it spoke it, something of the words and forms of speech, of its own native language. So in Syria, the Syriac, in Palestine, the Aramaic or Hebrew of that day, in Egypt, the Coptic, would, to some extent, give *coloring* to the common Greek speech. This Aramaic or late-Hebrew coloring in the New Testament diction, is clearly defined and is well understood.

There have been two extremes with reference to the New Testament Greek;—some supposing thereby to vindicate its Divine origin, claimed for it pure classicity; others, degrading it to the lowest level of barbarous Greek.

Both are entirely untrue. The New Testament offers no great difficulties to the Greek scholar, and the numerous grammars of the New Testament Greek have long since thoroughly explored this field and made everything in it clear: so that we know to the smallest niceties in what respects and how far it differs from the Classic Greek, and what influence the national speech and the religion of the Jews had upon it.—After these general observations, we come directly to the matter before us.

The question then is, what is the meaning in the Hellenistic and New Testament Greek of the word *baptizo* and its derivative nouns?

And, first,—do the authoritative grammars on the New Testament diction enumerate this word as among those that have suffered a radical

or essential change from their former classic use? We have before us several of these grammars, and not one so presents this word. Winer's large, exhaustive work, that points out and treats of all the lexical and grammatical peculiarities of the New Testament Greek, specifying every word and expression, even to the smallest particles, that are in any way affected by the peculiarities of the New Testament diction, knows nothing of any such change in baptizo and its derivatives, as this pedobaptist argument on the peculiarities of the New Testament Greek insists on. In Trollope's full and admirable critical Greek Grammar, covering precisely the field of this argument, there is not a single intimation concerning any change in *baptizo*, as to the action indicated by it. There is indeed reference to this word.—In speaking of the preposition *ἐν*, he quotes Mark i. 9, as follows: "*ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην*, he was baptized by immersion in the Jordan." (p. 175). Such is the knowledge of this eminent scholar and clergyman of the church of England, as to the meaning of this word 'in the New Testament and Hellenic dialect'!

So much for Grammars of the New Testament diction. We shall cite New Testament Lexicons before we conclude this article. We shall now refer to the most direct class of evidence in this case,—writers in the Hellenic dialect, whose testimony must be conclusive. And we shall first select those more immediately connected with the New Testament.

The writers that most closely represent the Greek as found in the New Testament are the translators of the Alexandrine version of the Old Testament,—commonly called the *Septuagint*, the authors of the apocryphal books of the Old and New Testaments, Josephus, and Philo the Alexandrian Jew, the later Greek versions of the Old Testament, and the Christian Fathers who wrote Greek. After these come the other writers who wrote in Hellenic dialect.

We first cite the *Septuagint*. This is a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, made by Jews, and represents fully the Hebrew-Greek form of the *common or Hellenic speech*, as current among the Greek-speaking Jews in Palestine, in Alexandria, and other Greek cities. The *Septuagint* may be regarded as the mother, religiously, of the New Testament Greek. The testimony it offers, therefore, of the meaning of *baptizo* is decisive as to its meaning in the New Testament,—both using the same Greek diction. How, then, is this word used in the *Septuagint*?

It occurs first 2 Kings v. 14, "And Naaman went down and baptized himself seven times in the Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God." The word in this passage as we have here indicted, is the word *baptizo*; does any one doubt its meaning here,—that it means to immerse? So the translators of our Common Version understood it,—for they render it "*dipped himself*," and so the whole English world reads it and has read it for over two centuries. It has always been understood so, and so translated by equivalent words in other tongues. The Latin Bible newly translated from the Hebrew and annotated by Tremellius and Junius, renders it '*immersit se in Jordanem*,' he immersed himself in Jordan. So also Pasor in his New Testament Lexicon under *baptizo*, '*immersit se Naaman in Iordane septies*,' Naaman immersed himself seven times in the Jordan. The word in the Hebrew original is the verb *taval*; what is its meaning? Stokius in his Hebrew Dictionary defines it—*tinxit, intinxit, immersit, demersit, baptein, baptizein*,—to dip, dip in, immerse, submerge, baptein, baptize. Gesenius defines it,—'to dip, dip in, to immerse,' and cites the case of Naaman as an example.

This is definite enough, surely, as to the meaning of the Hebrew word,

represented in this passage by 'baptizo,'—*it never means anything but immerse, dip, or submerge*. The verb *baptizo* occurs again in the Septuagint, Isa. xxi. 4.—*ἀνομία με βαπτίζει*—iniquity over-whelms me,* referring to the depths of terror and misery into which iniquity sinks. In his Lexicon to the New Testament Greek, under *baptizo*, Bretschneider, referring to the symbolical use of the word, says: "In a tropical sense, 'to be baptized with the baptism of any one'—as Math. xx. 22, &c., signifies to suffer what another suffers, to be overwhelmed with that with which he is overwhelmed, *isdem obrui, qua ille obruitur*. As also in Latin *submergo*, just like the Greek *baptizo*, in profane writers very often signifies to be overwhelmed with something, to be immersed in something, as Isa. xxi. 4, (quoting the very passage before us—L.), Josephus, Wars. 4, 3: 3. 'they baptized the city,'" &c., &c.—adding other examples. This tropical use of the word to denote to be overwhelmed with misfortune, is abundant. As David says: "All thy waves and thy billows are gone over me." Ps. xlii. 7.

In the apocryphal books, the word occurs in Judith, xii. 5, 9—"and Judith went forth by night into the valley of Bethulia, and baptized herself in the camp at the fountain." With the meaning of *baptizo* as above fixed in the case of Naaman, who was told 'to wash' or bathe 'himself,'—and went out as ordered, to the Jordan to do it, and did it by dipping himself, according to the commandment of the man of God; and also with the well-known custom of the Jewish bathings before us, the case of Judith is clear,—that she bathed or immersed herself at this place. If her purpose had been merely to wash by pouring,—for sprinkling is of course out of the question,—surely to go this inconvenient distance by night to the fountain would not have been necessary, as she could with much greater comfort have done it in her tent where all necessary conveniences could have been had.

In the *Wisdom of Sirach*, commonly called *Ecclesiasticus*, xxxiv. 25, we have "baptizing himself from a dead body, and touching it again, what is he profited by his bathing—*το λουτρον*—? This denotes the *bathing of the body* to purify from contact with the dead, and is a washing, or bathing, like that of Naaman, which was likewise for purification. Bretschneider, in his Greek-Latin Lexicon for the New Testament, refers to these cases in his definition of *baptizo* as follows; "*baptiza*,—(frequentative of *bapto*), properly signifies, I dip often, I wash (or bathe) often; then I wash, I wash off, [or completely—L.] with the signification of the middle voice, I wash myself, I wash myself off [or completely—L.]; Mark vii. 4,—unless they wash themselves, Luke xi. 38; (2 Kings v. 14,—[the case of Naaman—L.] Judith xii. 7; Sirach xxxi. 25); I immerse into water; I submerge. In the New Testament it is only applied to the solemn and sacred submersion used by the Jews," &c., &c. This states the case clearly. Baptizo properly, as a frequentative of *bapto*, signifies frequent or full dipping in water—hence, and with this sense, to wash,—to perform ablution, &c.—as illustrated in the cases of Naaman, Judith, ablution from a dead body, &c.; so used relative to the sacred washings of the Jews in the New Testament,—as ablutions by submersion. As is the case of Naaman, so are also the others.

So much for the meaning of *baptizo* in the Hellenic dialect as found in the Septuagint and the Apocrypha of the Jews. The conclusion in the next number.

C. L. L.

* Our Common version translates the Hebrew differently from the Septuagint,—'fearfulness affrighted me.'

"THAT I MAY KNOW HIM."

THERE is something exceedingly striking in Paul's fervid desire to know Christ—to get to know Him, better, as he had never yet done. What sort of knowledge respecting his Lord is the Apostle panting after?

Is it *historical* knowledge? Is it of this he feels a deficiency? Is the Apostle travelling about to find up such as were personally acquainted with Jesus while He was on earth;—that from their lips he may elicit additional and fuller narrations of all that Jesus began both to do and teach until the day on which He was taken up? We have no reason to think so. He was not deficient of this sort of knowledge. He had been supplied with it from the best possible source. We need not deny that this accomplished Apostle may have sat for hours at the feet of humble men and women, listening with profound delight to their memories of the Master—it would seem a most unnatural indifference to the testimony of eye and ear witnesses to attribute to our Apostle, were we to entertain any such conception of him. But, at all events, he had been to a higher school to receive all those great historical facts, without which he could not have been an Apostle of Christ. He had been in repeated communication with the risen Lord Himself. This is a circumstance which we do not, perhaps, sufficiently appreciate. In all that went to constitute Paul an Apostle, he received instruction from the glorified lips of his Lord. He positively assures us of this when he tells us (Gal. i.) that he was "an Apostle not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead;" and that the gospel which he preached was "not after man": "I neither received it of man, neither was taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." We have more than this general disclaimer to guide us. We distinctly know that the first appearing of the Lord Jesus to Paul was accompanied by a verbal communication (Acts xxvi. 15—18); that the Lord, at the same time, promised to appear to him again, respecting further matters of ministry and testimony; that the Saviour did again appear to him, in a trance in Jerusalem, and held a conversation with his new disciple (Acts xxii. 17—21); that it was directly from the Lord himself that he received a detailed account of the institution of the memorial feast (1 Cor. xi.); and, in general, that he was favoured with so many visions and revelations as to put him in danger of being "exalted above measure." We have, therefore, no more ground in the facts of the case than we have in any confession of deficient information from the Apostle himself, on which to base the conclusion that Paul is here coveting fuller historical knowledge of Christ. Paul possessed historical knowledge in abundance: he had received it, down to minute details, from the highest possible source. Moreover, he had complete mastery of the historical knowledge he possessed. What a splendid combination of both we have in 1 Cor. xv. 3—7. Where else have we so complete an account of the appearance of the risen Saviour; and, where, such a logically triumphant presentation of them? Assuredly, then, our Apostle displays no deficiency of historical knowledge concerning his Lord: he knows of none, admits none. He may have been taunted with not having "known Christ after the flesh" (2 Cor. v.); but his reply to that taunt leaves no room for the conjecture that, after all, herein he was conscious of inferiority. Had others seen the Lord? So had he. Had others conversed with the Lord? So had he. Had others received commissions from the Lord? So had he. Not, then, for more historical knowledge can Paul here be

longing: *yet is he dissatisfied*—dissatisfied with his *knowledge of Christ*; for he is ready to put forth any effort, to make any sacrifice, if only he may *get to know him*.

Is it, then, for *more heavenly revelations* that he is craving? Jesus has already appeared to him on several occasions—coming from heaven to Paul; and Paul has been to Jesus—has been caught away unto a third heaven, into Paradise, and heard "unutterable utterances which it is not allowable for a man to speak." Is it more of these that the Apostle here covets? We cannot think so. No one can think so who will carefully observe the difference of moral tone and influence associated respectively with the visions and revelations referred to in 2 Cor. xi. and xii., and with the earnest longing of this chapter of Phillippians. *That knowledge* had a tendency to puff up, *this* to build up. Only as goaded on to it by unscrupulous opponents, would he boast of *that knowledge*; of *this* he glories with no sort of misgiving. In *that knowledge* he stood *alone*, it was useful to him in his official capacity, as an Apostle whose commission was peculiarly open to be questioned by unscrupulous opponents; but, in his eagerness to obtain *this knowledge*, he can propose himself as a pattern for his brethren (ver. 17), and exhort them to be of one mind with himself (ver. 15). Again, therefore, must we come to a negative conclusion; *this knowledge*—this supernatural knowledge, if so we may distinguish it—is not what Paul wants.

To obtain the true answer to our inquiry, let us remember that, to Paul, Christ was not a mere historical person, to be thought of as figuring in the past, but one to be regarded as still living and working, giving ever fresh illustrations of the beauty of his character, ever new tokens of the resources of his power, ever fuller developments of the riches of his love. To Paul's apprehension, the Lord Jesus had taken the marvels of his life, death, and resurrection with him up into heaven; and it was there that Paul beheld him: it was from thence he knew that Jesus reciprocated his devotion and service. And thus Paul's conception of his Lord was an upward one. Nor an upward one only, but an onward one as well. That loved Lord—whom at first he saw from heaven, and again and again had seen from heaven, and whom by faith he daily saw in heaven—was coming back to earth again. The certain and commanding expectation of his Lord's promised advent, gave tone to all the Apostle's aspirations towards his Redeemer. Christ was coming, and Paul was running to meet him: was coming for his bride, and Paul was busy preparing her for her Lord. Paul was toiling in Gentile lands to extend and fill up the elect assembly, and with an enthusiasm fired by his profound regard for his heavenly Master he was counting upon acceptance with Him for his gains from heathen nations; anxious to lose none of those gains; warning every man, and teaching every man, in order not to lose any, but present every man converted by his instrumentality perfect when his Lord should come. Christ was coming to reign, and be honoured before all eyes, and rule all nations; and Paul was striving, and straining every nerve, imposing on himself severe discipline, suffering the loss of all things, that he might be accounted worthy to share in the coming glory. He was toiling and suffering—not with philosophic, stoic, hardness, but—with the hardness of a soldier (2 Tim. ii.) inspired with intense enthusiasm for his king and cause. From such a king as he served, and for deeds done to advance such a cause, Paul unquestionably coveted honor, panted for distinction: how could he otherwise? By faith he already saw his Lord's approving smile, and heard his generous

well done! Got a glimpse of the crown of righteousness in reserve for him. Nay! Paul's devotion to his Saviour must have led him largely to merge his own joy in the joys of his Lord. That heart that had writhed with many a pang in remembrance of having ruthlessly persecuted the Head in heaven, through its members on earth, was capable of liveliest anticipations of the mutual joy of Redeemer and redeemed, in the looked for gathering of the glorified assembly.

And thus our Apostle was at the furthest remove from feeling that he had done with Christ, that his acquaintance with Him could not become yet more intimate, that there was no deeper depth in him yet to be sounded. The present Christ in heaven, the future Christ from heaven, was master of Paul's entire manhood. Love to this living, unexhausted, Christ had thrown its roots around all the core of his being. And just here—in the sphere of love, that most delicately appreciative capacity—while he feels that he does know Christ, already, in measure, he would fain know Him yet more intimately. This is that further knowledge of Christ which Paul so intensely craved: it was further experimental discovery of Him, further experimental realisation of Him, further experimental appreciation of Him. Paul wanted to receive out of Christ's life into his own: Christ's power into his weakness, Christ's light into his darkness, Christ's patience into his impatience. He craved to *know* more of Christ by *having* more of Christ. He was persuaded that there was a fulness in Christ, a satisfaction of heart, an end of being, which could be known only by being enjoyed. Paul longed to *live* into this deeper knowledge of Christ. All his weighty words hereabouts reveal this. I am still counting all things but dung that I may win Christ: I want to grasp Him, as finally and irrevocably mine. I would be found—when the great discoveries of His return are made, when He shall bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the secrets of the hearts: then would I be found—in Him, having a righteousness about me that shall approve itself divine. Thus to win Christ, thus to be found of Him, I must know Him: must know the power of His resurrection in its hold upon me; in the strength it imparts, the love it enkindles, the patience it sustains. Thus girded about by the power of His resurrection, and thus only, shall I be able to dive down into the fellowship of His sufferings; thus only shall I be advancing—my sympathy of love, devotion, self-denial, submission—in spiritual conformity to His death. This therefore is the experimental discovery of Christ I would make, the life-knowledge of Him I would gain. I would find out, by realising it, all that He can be to me, all that He can do for me. To the acquisition of this knowledge, I well know that self-denial, self-surrender, self-sacrifice, are indispensable: I have counted the cost;—and am willing to pay it:—if by any means, even means as costly as these, *I may advance into the out-resurrection, which is out from dead ones*: I would win a place in the glorified assembly of first-born ones, most nearly and illustriously associated with the First-begotten One himself: He is my goal. To know Him, to be found of Him, to win Him; now in obedience and suffering, then in reward and glory, this is my aim.

May every Christian reader be fired by the same ardour, covet more of the same knowledge, long for a more complete fellowship with the same still-living Christ. In our afflictions may we know more of His sympathy; in our labours, more of His support; in our love, more of His preciousness. Upheld in suffering, may we realise that it is Christ who upholds us; wise and patient in toil, may we discover that it is Christ's wisdom that directs us, His meekness and gentleness that soothes and sweetens. And then may it

please Him who has given us to know Him experimentally, while bearing the cross, to disclose Himself to our astonished and adoring vision, when His time shall come for bestowing on us our crown. Amen.

London, June 1st, 1870.

J. B. ROTHERHAM.

HOW CAN WE KNOW?

When we are called to die, how can we know that we are accepted of God and will be saved? I have been led to special reflection upon this subject by a recent funeral sermon to which I listened. It was over the remains of a young man who had suddenly fallen by a pistol shot and died in a few hours. He had lived a totally irreligious, though not an unusually immoral life. During his last few hours of suffering, the preacher stated that he had engaged with him in prayer, and conversed with him fully in reference to his prospects. The young man prayed very earnestly, and expressed very great penitence, but when finally asked if he thought he was accepted he could not give an affirmative answer. The preacher urged him and entreated him to "believe that he was accepted," but he could not induce him to express a favorable conviction. In this condition he died, and the preacher very justly remarked, "it is not my province to preach him to heaven."

It was clear from the course of the preacher's remarks, that he would have reported him saved, if he could only have induced the young man to feel and believe that all was well with him; and thus a dying man's testimony is taken as conclusive proof of his own salvation or damnation.

It is commonly conceded that a dying man's words are honest, seeing that earthly inducements have lost their power, and the soul is about to enter into the presence of God. But does a dying man know any more than a living man the exact nature of his relations to God? Is there anything in the mental excitement which must necessarily attend the hour of death, and especially the death of a sinner, to make one a good judge of his acceptance with God? We know that men often deceive themselves while in the full exercise of their mental faculties, and suppose that there is nothing for them to dread in eternity; may they not still more frequently deceive themselves in death, when there is so intense a desire to feel safe, and when the prayers, and tears, and entreaties of friends are engaged in stimulating this desire to the utmost? Certainly this question is not difficult to answer.

Another question, still more fundamental than the preceding, presents itself at this point. By what is a man to judge of his prospects in the hour of death? Is it by his feelings at the time? Or is it by the life which he has led? Or is it by both of these properly combined? If we say it is by his feelings at the time, the standard itself is a most uncertain one, as we have above suggested. If we say it is by the past life, there is still some uncertainty, because a man is in danger of over-estimating the virtues of his own life. There is one case, it is true, in which there can be no mistake. If a man, previous to his final sickness, became a Christian, obtaining remission of his alien sins, and from that time till the hour of death maintained a consistent life, confessing before God from day to day his daily sins, he has but a small account to render in death, and may depart with the utmost assurance of acceptance with God. Such a man will never be in doubt, unless the nature of the disease is such as to disorder the brain and vitiate the memory or the reason. But if a man has

been a careless and negligent disciple, and must on his death-bed, seek the forgiveness of many sins which had not concerned him while in health, it is impossible that he should have as well grounded an assurance of peace with God. It is impossible that he or his friends shall know to what extent his late repentance is merely the remorse of one who can sin no longer, because life is over, and his peace of mind the result of self-deception. Still more is this true of the man who has led an ungodly life until arrested by the summons of death. Let this, then, be our reliance, the only one which can serve us without fail in the last hour—we will serve the Lord with all diligence every day, and confess before him all our sins, and when the final moment comes, we will trust in the mercy of God for the forgiveness of all shortcomings, and close our eyes in peace.

M. LARD.

MINISTRY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST—No. VIII.

ELDERS, SHEPHERDS, OVERSEERS.

As Paul appointed Timothy to remain in Ephesus and Titus in Crete, that they might set in order the wanting things and ordain Elders, it was most fitting that he remind them concerning the qualifications prerequisite to that ordination. Accordingly in writing to Timothy he said: "A Bishop (Overseer) *must be*—" and then follows a specification of said requirements. In instructing Titus he wrote: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting and ordain Elders in every city, as I had appointed thee; if any be blameless—" and then, also, there follow several indispensable qualities, substantially agreeing with those cited to Timothy. Reference to 1 Tim. iii. and Titus i. gives them as under:

TIMOTHY.

Blameless
Husband of one Wife
Vigilant
Sober
Of good behaviour
Given to hospitality
Apt to teach
Not given to wine
No striker
Not greedy of filthy lucre
Patient
Not a brawler
Not covetous
Ruling well his house
Not a novice
Good report from without

TITUS.

Blameless
Husband of one Wife
Having faithful children
Not self-willed
Not soon angry
Not given to wine
No striker
Not given to filthy lucre
A lover of hospitality
A lover of good men
Sober
Just
Holy
Temperate
Holding fast the word

The foregoing two-fold specification indicates what every Elder *must be*. When men thus qualified are ordained, then may be said to them "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Spirit hath made you Overseers." (Acts xx.) Elders qualified and ordained according to the direction of the Holy Spirit, through the Apostles, are made Overseers by the Spirit whose law and rule are thus observed.

Some have argued that we are not to look for all the specified items in each Elder, but to find the whole in the sundry brethren of whom the Eldership is composed. But that fancy is groundless. The ordination is restricted to the qualified; none other are warranted to allow themselves

to be ordained, and neither Evangelist nor Church have authority to ordain any other. Nor are the qualifications marvellous exactions. Which of them should a christian husband and father be content to want? Everyone should aim to become all that is here required.

Let us, in the next place, glance at the requirements in the order in which they are cited.

"*Blameless*"—Not absolutely so, as before God; for, as everyone falls short of perfection of character, all are more or less subject to blame. The word rendered "*blameless*" signifies "*not open to be attacked*," and marks one against whom no evil charge can be maintained. We understand it in this case to refer *specially* to all that follows, and, therefore, to intimate that Elders must be persons against whom, in the particulars specified, no charge can be sustained.

"*The Husband of one Wife*"—We consider that either polygamy or celibacy disqualifies for the Eldership. It has been urged that celibacy cannot do so, as in that case, Paul and Timothy would have been disqualified, certainly they would, and there is no evidence that they were not. No one can produce proof that they were qualified for the Elder's office, and nowhere are we taught that the qualifications for an Apostle, an Evangelist, and an Elder are the same. On the point now immediately under notice, nothing could be more fitting than that Apostles and Evangelists, whose work largely required them to move from place to place, and generally rendered impossible a settled home, should be unmarried; while on the other hand, nothing is more seemly and desirable than that overseers in one church, whose duties require settled residence and involve frequent interposition between husband and wife, parents and children, should themselves be married men, who have given evidence that they understand and rightly deport themselves in that relationship. No one can fail to see that such, other circumstances being equal, could not but present a fitness for the office which the unmarried are without. This is our conclusion, after years of thoughtful investigation, and after reading, perhaps, all that can be said on either side. Still the fact remains, that thoughtful, learned, pious brethren conclude that it is not certain that the intention is wider than the exclusion of the polygamist, and, therefore, they decline to reject an unmarried man, who is, in all other respects, qualified. Now, we are not prepared to say that these brethren must of *necessity* be wrong. That they are wrong we have little or no doubt, but the impossibility of their being right is not here affirmed. How then shall the difficulty be met? Each church must meet it for itself and the understanding of the majority must prevail. Not that the church shall decree what the interpretation shall be; but that each member determine, for himself, whether the person, or persons, named has, or have, the required qualifications; each to determine this according to his own understanding of the terms, and the declared will of the majority must be taken as the church-recognition or non-recognition of the fitness of the men submitted for their judgement. But just here comes in an important consideration, which to some extent should influence the decision. There is perfectly safe and certain ground. If only those are ordained who possess the other qualifications and who also are married, every one will then know that the requirements are fully met. Thus perfectly safe and reliable ground invites to occupation.

"*Vigilant*." Because the word thus translated is derived from *νηφειν*, to be sober, some conclude to read *sober* in place of *vigilant*. But as *νηφειν*, also signifies to watch and as sobriety is referred to in a subsequent verse, *νηφαλιον*

is very properly rendered by *vigilant, attentive, or watchful*. A careless, sleepy, dilatory man should not be ordained.

"Sober." There is here no exclusive or special reference to intoxicating drink. A well regulated mind is indicated—a person who is free from excesses, prudent.

"Of good behaviour." The idea of *adornment and order* underlie this word. The Elder then should be polite, courteous. A rude, uncouth man is as much out of place in an eldership as would be a bull in a china shop.

"Given to hospitality." Literally, *a lover of strangers*.—One who manifests an hospitable disposition. Not necessarily one who gives much, for he may have but little to give. We *know* some of our poorest brethren as the most hospitable in our fellowship. The disposition displays itself, not merely, or chiefly, in large gifts, but in loving attention according to means.

"Apt to teach." Acquainted with the plan of salvation, the order and worship of the Church, and able to communicate to others what he knows. All Elders are to be capable of teaching. The notion of Ruling Elders, who have no teaching ability nor work is not admissible. It does not, however, follow that an Elder must be an orator, a pulpit or platform man, one who can sermonize for an hour and entrance an audience. He who knows the truth and is capable of instructing a young convert therein, who can in converse, guard him against the subtleties of false teachers, and in this way instruct the members of the church generally, is all that the place demands, and able in conjunction with others to shepherd the flock. Restrict the Eldership to those who are attractive public speakers, and you will have to wait long for the men. But the requirement does not necessarily include ability to deliver lectures and orations. He who presides over the church should be able to address it upon points of order, but the president is not of necessity the chief speaker, nor even a prominent one. In an Eldership, every member of which is capable of teaching, there will be those better fitted than others for addressing the church at large, and they will, of course, have assigned to them a prominent portion in that work. The Elder's work is wholly in the church. An Elder may be the chief preacher and labour much to convert sinners, as he may be the chief singer and lead and much improve the service of song, but he does not that work by virtue of his office. An order of itinerant "pastors" who do the preaching for any church which may hire them appertains not to apostolic christianity.

It should also be observed, that to a certain extent the ability of an Elder must correspond to the condition of the church. Take a church chiefly or altogether composed of uneducated labouring people. In that case certain men would meet the requirements of the position, who, if removed to a church of much higher educational range, would be entirely inadequate. Here we see the wisdom of the apostolic plan, by which an ordained Elder is such only in the church in which his ordination was effected. If he visit or remove to another church, near or distant, he goes not as an Elder, and he has no official status there until his fitness is recognized and he is also there ordained. Each church is then called to discern as to the fitness of those to whom they submit themselves, and no man takes office in one church by virtue of having filled it in another.

"Not given to wine." The phrase is *μη̃ πάροινος*. Literally "*Not near wine*," not a banqueter. The ancient *paroinos* was one accustomed to drinking parties. We take the phrase to express not so much personal sobriety, as absence from convivial drinking parties and entertainments. An Overseer in the Church of God is not only to be sober, but is required

to discountenance places, practices, and associations, dangerous to the sobriety of others.

"No striker." A peaceable man—not one who in haste of temper would be led to strike an opposer.

"Not greedy of filthy lucre." Not one who earns money by base methods. Such is the import of the term. But there is no allusion to useful and honorable trades or callings. Paul commanded the overseers of the church in Ephesus to work with their own hands. It is no where implied that Elders should depend upon the flock for support, nor intimated that they did so. All useful trades and professions are open to them, but none that are base and injurious.

"Patient." Distinguished for meekness under provocation and candour in judging the failings of others: "In meekness instructing those who oppose themselves."

"Not a brawler." Not given to contention and strife.

"Not covetous." Not a lover of money. One anxious to get all he can, keep what he gets, and do but little for the church and the poor, is for ever excluded.

"One that ruleth well his own house." One who keeps good order in his establishment; whose children and dependents are in proper subjection. He, then, who has a disorderly family, or an insubordinate household, is excluded, and for the best of reasons; he shows that he cannot rule and, therefore, is unfit for the office. It is not clear that there must be children, but if there be they must be in subjection. "If a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God."

"Not a novice." Not a new convert; "lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil."

"A good report of them which are without." One, who in the foregoing particulars cannot be condemned by the world, and whose conduct cannot be pointed to as inconsistent with his profession.

Thus we have gone over the qualifications as expressed by Paul to Timothy. The outline, given by the same apostle, to Titus differs but little in form and still less in substance. In place of "One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection," we find "*Having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly*"; which we take as of the same import.

"Not self-willed," stands out as a clear and important requirement. A self-willed man in an Eldership creates no end of trouble. Such an one, should fill no office in the Church of God.

"Temperate." The term used signifies *self-restraining* (as to the appetites) *abstinent*.

"Holding fast the faithful word." Thus only can the work of a shepherd be done. False teachers will arise among the flock, who, with sound doctrine, must be exhorted and refuted.

Thus we have spread before us an outline of character, which every brother ought to strive to realize. Let this holy striving go on, as it should, and the Church will not long pine for want of good and efficient Elders, Bishops, Overseers. Neglect this striving and they can never be had. Colleges cannot make them; they cannot be imported ready for use; in the Churches they must grow, or they never can be had. Extraordinary material is not needed in order to their formation; ordinary men with fair devotion to the Lord and His truth, looking for, and giving themselves

to, usefulness in the Church of God are all we need in order that the Lord may raise up among us shepherds after His own heart—*good* shepherds, who shall receive from the Chief Shepherd the reward of life eternal, when He appears.

D K.

"THAT SUNDAY DINNER!"

"Well, and what about the Sunday dinner?" say you. Has a man not as good a right to eat heartily on Sunday, as on any other day? A married couple may surely be one in the Lord and pray heartily on the Sundays, without being called upon, as a matter of duty, to fast also? Granted; by all means have your dinner; eat, drink and "rejoice with the wife of thy bosom," only take care that while the body is well fed with the good things of this life, that its neighbour, the soul, be not starved through sheer neglect of spiritual things, by the misuse of time spent in getting the dinner ready.

Yes, it is not so much the dinner itself as the *amount* of precious time spent in the cooking of it, that I grudge.

"Ah! but," you say, "it's very hard that when a man has been labouring for the whole week, and not able to come home to a bit o' hot dinner, that he should be served up with cold meat and potatoes on Sunday also."

Very hard indeed, echo a thousand worldly voices, who have never learnt either the a b c of self denial or kitchen economy; moral and social virtues worthy indeed of more earnest study and practice, by those who profess the Divine life.

"Cleanliness is next to Godliness" says an eminent Divine, and if that be true, then kitchen economy may be a help to true virtue in a Christian household. Looking with sober glance at the prevailing apostacy from decency and good order among the people of God, by unnecessary culinary exercise on the Lord's day, I venture to say, that the mother in Israel, who sets a good example to the sisterhood, by cooking her Sunday's dinner on Saturday, is worthy of double honour for her work's sake. Of course warmed up victuals are not so nice as freshly cooked, but rest assured from the experience of many who have tried the plan, that the trouble of mind and body saved, will more than repay the heart in the morning's service, by a greater zest and relish for things divine.

"All very well," some sister thinks, "but Bro. John *will* have his dinner," and to gratify our good friend's palate—not to mention her own—and to keep him in that proverbial good humour, which a nicely cooked dinner inspires, his "better half" must slink out from a back seat as soon as the "Box" has gone round, and hurry home to her household gods—the kitchen, the kidney beans, and the pudding! O yes, depend upon it, that if the heart is in the frying pan it cannot be in the chapel; and while to all appearance we are intently listening to that good brother, earnestly exhorting us to "set our affections upon things above," the savoury odour of Rachel's mess of pottage steals over the soul, blinds the spiritual sense, and threatens to steal from us our birth-right of eternal life. Oh that all would remember that the Searcher of hearts is ever near to discover whether it be a work of necessity or mercy, which prompts anyone to disturb the peace and good order of the Assembly, by the buzz and flutter of a departure in the middle of the worship, and will note down the deed accordingly in His memoranda. Family cares may at times call for such a proceeding, but surely never to a truly pious heart the paltry gratification of the Sunday dinner!

But in addition to the disquiet caused in the Church, and the injury done to the divine life of the family concerned, pray how many empty benches has this social institution of the Sunday dinner to account for? A great many it is to be feared. Saturday evening comes and the marketing is got in, meat, vegetables, fruit &c., and Bro. John and his wife feel quite knocked up by their stroll through town and retire to rest leaving everything unprepared till the morrow. Early on Sunday morning then the operations commence just when the mind should be fixed calmly upon the sacred duties and privileges of the blessed day and engaged in the solemn work of self examination or in the devout study of a portion of the Life-giving Word—the peas have to be shelled and washed, the potatoes peeled, and, leaving out of sight the inevitable joint, could not the pudding tell a wondrous tale of the devotion paid to it? No wonder wives are tired after such work, and quite unfitted either in body or spirit to attend upon the means of grace. Some Phœbe may say to one of them, "Sister, O why wer'n't you at chapel yesterday morning?" And she replies, "I felt so faint and weary, and 'tis so hot, and the baby was so cross &c., &c., &c., that I really could not come out"; but no mention is made of the morning's worship paid at the shrine of the Sunday dinner. The prophet Jeremiah says something not very complimentary about this kind of skin deep virtue, this varnish of holiness, being swept away as the "refuge of lies." Assuredly it will, and every blameworthy husband or wife, every deceitful heart, be fully exposed in the light of the Great Day of Account. Happy those who are then found girt about with the garments of truth, clad in all the beauty of holiness in Christ Jesus, for they only will stand approved by Him.

Again, one reason for the indulgence of Sunday is the miserable scrap dinner served up in so many cases on the Saturday. Can you wonder then, that if Bro. John must play the stoic to day that he should take amends of fate by appearing as the epicurean to-morrow? Nature will have her due. Why not then as far as possible make all days alike? If there must be one fast each week then Sunday at once recommends itself as the most fitting time, both on Physiological and Scriptural grounds.

As to the benefits derivable from fasting; in the clear brain and soul in tune for true worship in the Sanctuary, let the practice of the modern jury and the ancient saints speak conclusively. (Ps. lxxix, 13. 1 Cor. ix, 27. Acts xiii, 2.) "He that is able to receive it let him receive it."

Those who are rich in this world having servants at home to do their culinary work can set a good example to their poorer neighbours in this matter. Cooks and servants in general should not be denied their "out" on a Sunday morning, *if they desire it*, to prepare a dinner for any Disciple. Remember the Golden Rule. The same exhortation to kitchen economy and self denial is needful to all classes, and indeed should shine as brightly among the home virtues of the rich as in those of the poor.

To all whom this homily may concern let me pray you see to it, that your consciences are clear, and your hands clean, as before God in this thing.

Small in itself and perhaps apt to raise a smile by its farcical surroundings, yet it is big with the spiritual well-being of the individuals and churches affected by it.

As a self-denying people Christians must not gratify their bodies at the expense of their souls; as Nonconformists, in the noblest sense of the term, they must not slavishly bow down before this national god of the Sunday dinner, but as the peculiar people of the Lord zealous of good works,

carefully stand aloof from every extreme in social customs bearing the appearance of evil. Surely it were better far, if need be, to have cold pie and potatoes, or cheese and a crust, moistened with a glass of "Adam's pale ale" from Nature's Brewery, and have a warm heart of love to Christ, and Him present at the table, than to delight in savoury viands with a heart cold to divine things and fully set upon earthly gratification, where God dwells not.

Whether in eating or in drinking may all who profess to love the Saviour do all to His praise and glory.

Birmingham.

TIMOTHY.

THE ORNAMENT OF A MEEK AND QUIET SPIRIT.

I HAVE thought it well to call the attention of my sisters to what the Scriptures teach with regard to meekness, gentleness, and a quiet spirit. I fear the subject is not so much thought of as many others we learn in Holy Writ.

Many who shrink with horror from the thought of lying or stealing seem either not to know, or not to think of, the wrong of giving way to bad temper. Others again who, perhaps, feel somewhat self-condemned after having thus given way excuse themselves by saying, "I am naturally passionate," or "I have naturally a bad temper and can't help it," forgetting that though by *nature* we *were* the children of wrath we *are* by adoption the children of God and followers of the meek and lowly Jesus. Unspeakable misery in domestic life is often caused by this want of meekness. The husband returns home wearied with his day's labour, fatigued in mind and body, needing the sweet influences of a peaceful, happy home to refresh his spirit, but instead of being greeted with a beaming smile of welcome and love from her who should be his helpmeet, he sees a peevish, discontented looking, face, and hears only snappish and unloving words; for although she loves him dearly, yet bad temper has, for the time, overcome her better feelings. But, although love may now exist, there is great danger, if this course is persisted in, that it will alienate the affections, and they will have no pleasure in each other's society. Some say, that their husbands are too exacting and expect to have their own way in everything, without regard to the comfort of their wives. Unhappily we sometimes see this to be the case. Undoubtedly it is hard to bear, and not in accordance with the teaching of God's word; but will bad temper and evil passion mend matters? Certainly not! Some glory in such resistance, and say it becomes them to assume an attitude of defiance. But they surely have not read, or are forgetful of, those passages which teach that the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, is in the sight of God of great price. Paul directs Christian women, whose husbands are not doing what is right, to win them to God's ways by good behaviour.

Family cares, are considered by some, as an excuse for bad temper. They are continually perplexed and annoyed by the petty disturbances which they meet with, and are made peevish and irritable. But, my dear sisters, remember that subduing your spirit is part of the battle you have to fight, and if you listen to the teaching of God, and go to Him in prayer for strength, He will give you the victory and the victor's prize. Remember Jesus says, "To him that overcome I will give to sit with me on my throne, as I have overcome and am set down with my Father on His throne."

If we are not watchful over our tempers we become stumbling blocks to others, both in and out of the church, for our friends and neighbours observe our conduct, and if they see ebullitions of temper they say, "Is this the way Christians act?" Hear how such a one speaks to her husband, or her children, or her neighbours: I am sure that is not right, and if that is what those who call themselves Christians do, I shall not go among them, for it is better not to profess Christianity, than professing it to act inconsistently." And so they are hindered from receiving the truth. Young and weak members are often discouraged and disappointed at finding such things in the church, where they expected to find peace, harmony, and love; and older and stronger ones often feel their spirits bowed down by the same cause, and so, in a measure, are unfitted for the work they wish to do in the Lord's vineyard. Women, it is generally said, are fond of ornament. Surely, then, it is well to adorn ourselves with a never ending one,—one which will never fade, but which will render us pleasing to every right-minded person, and above all, in the sight of God, prove of great price.

Meekness does not imply lack of courage; it does not mean that we are to give way to what is wrong to please either friends or foes. We are told to add to our faith courage; that is, courage to do all that we know to be right, in the face of all opposition or persecution. Moses, we are told was very meek above all men on the earth, but he had courage to endure affliction with the people of God, rather than enjoy the pleasures of Egypt with sinners, for he looked forward to the recompence of reward. Let us record a few passages of Scripture shewing the blessings promised to the meek. In the Psalms we read, "The meek will He guide in judgment." "The meek will He teach His way." "The meek shall inherit the earth, and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace." "The Lord lifted up the meek: He will beautify the meek with salvation." In Isaiah we read, "The meek also shall increase their joy in the Lord." The Saviour's words are, "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth." We have also His example; He said, "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly." And we know that He bore more than we can ever be called to bear.

Paul enumerates among the work of the flesh, "variance, wrath, strife," but the fruit of the spirit is a great contrast. It is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, temperance, meekness, against such there is no law, and they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh. Have we done so? If we have, happy are we. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit. To the Ephesians he says, "I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that you walk worthy of the calling with which you are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, bearing with one another in love, earnestly endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace." To the Colossians he wrote, "Put on, as the elect of God, a merciful disposition, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long suffering."

He exhorted Timothy to "follow after meekness." Titus he instructed to remind those to whom he was sent, that they were to be "ready for every good work," "not to be contentious, but gentle, shewing all meekness to all men." James says, "Who is wise and discreet among you, let him shew by good behaviour his works, with the meekness of wisdom." Paul could say to the Thessalonians, that he had been gentle among them, and he exhorted them to earnestly endeavour to live quietly. He tells Timothy, that the servant of God must not be contentious, but gentle to

all men, patient under evils, in meekness instructing those who oppose themselves.

The wisdom from above is first pure, then peaceable, full of mercy and good fruits. Let us not deceive ourselves; if we live according to the flesh we shall die, but if through the Spirit we put to death the deeds of the flesh we shall live, for as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. Many more passages might be added, but these may suffice to stimulate us to follow after those virtues, which our Heavenly Father has been pleased to say are, in His sight, of great price.

Birmingham.

HELEN.

ECCE HOMO.

Ecce Homo! See suspended,
On the rude accursed tree,
Him whose love to all extended,
And whose heart o'erflows to see
Men, for whom he bleeds and dies,
All His wondrous love despise.

Ecce Homo! Lo, what sadness
Gathers o'er His gentle face;
As they pierce Him in their madness,
And in fervent words He prays—
"Father spare, forgive them too,
For they know not what they do."

Ecce Homo! "It is finished!"
Hear the loud triumphant cry!
Hell falls back with power diminished,
Demons from the conflict fly,
Blood-stained mortals haste away,
Scared by darkness at noon-day.

Ecce Homo! Now behold Him!
Laid by hands of tenderest love,
In the grave that cannot hold Him,
Heir of royalties above!—
Owned by angels as their king,
In their ceaseless minist'ring!

Ecce Homo! Calmly sleeping;
Free from taint—divinely pure,
God His HOLY ONE is keeping—
Making His great promise sure;
Soon His FIRST-BORN to recall,
And proclaim him Lord of all.

Ecce Homo! God hath spoken!
And the Seal, the Stone, the Rock—
Rend, are rolled away, or broken,
In the earthquake's fearful shock;
Jesus rises from the grave,
Mighty in His power to save.

Ecce Homo! Sinner, view Him!
 Slain and glorified for thee!
 'Twas thy need of help that drew Him,
 From His throne to Calvary.
 Would'st thou all His riches prove?
 Give thyself to Him in love.

G. Y. T.

Open Council.

THE YEAR OF CHRIST'S BIRTH.

ALL biblical scholars will be interested in a book, recently published by Dr. Zumpt, of Leipzig, on the above subject, entitled "The Year of Christ's Birth: Historical and Chronological Investigations." Dr. Zumpt is evidently a master of Roman history, and gives in this work a number of facts and inferences which go a long way towards clearing up the historical difficulty involved in the above question, and the proving of the chronology of Luke as correct, which, at first sight, does not appear to be so. Luke is the only Evangelist who gives us anything like sufficient data by which we can ascertain the time of the birth of Christ, and yet both the specifications of time contained in his gospel have given cause to no little doubt. He says, "In the days of Herod, the king of Judea," or Herod the great, Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, received prophetic testimony of a son's birth, who was accordingly born in due course within the year, and that our Lord's birth took place within a few months after, and therefore presumably, also during the lifetime of Herod. And the testimony of Matthew is to the effect that at least a year, if not more, must have elapsed between the birth of Christ, and the death of Herod the great. Now the death of this Herod occurred in the beginning of the year B.C. 4, which seems to prove an error in the date of the present era by nearly five years. But Luke gives us another and an apparently more accurate means of arriving at the exact date, for he says, in the second chapter, as an introduction to his record of the birth of Christ, "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed (literally enrolled in census-lists), and this taxing (census-taking) was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria." And here rises a double difficulty: Josephus says Cyrenius was governor of Syria, and author of census in which all the property of the Jews was estimated for taxing purposes in A.D. 6, and nothing is known directly of any other census by him or anyone else; here is difficulty number one. The second is that the mode of census-taking, mentioned by Luke, of assembling all the members of one house, in a particular town set apart for that house, is one for which there is no Roman precedent. The chronological confusion is also apparently increased by Luke, saying that, "in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar," John the Baptist entered upon his public ministry, preceding, to all appearance, by only a few months that of our Saviour's; that year being for the most part the same as A.D. 29, this would make Christ at least thirty-four years of age instead of "about thirty," as mentioned by Luke himself. So that at first sight there are

not a few inconsistencies in Luke's history. The difficulty of unlocking the historical difficulty is increased by our altogether wanting any history of the Roman administration of Syria from B.C. 4 to A.D. 4, of any regularity, only isolated facts are mentioned here and there. Dr. Zumpt seems to establish beyond doubt that Quirinius was the governor of Syria before his appointment in A.D. 6, and that he was in all probability appointed in B.C. 4. But then B.C. 4 would be after the death of Herod the great, and, accordingly, not at the time mentioned for our Saviour's birth. Dr. Zumpt points out that Luke does not say our Lord was born under the rule of Quirinius in Syria, but only during the taxing or census-taking of Judea, which was "the first census of Quirinius as governor." A census, especially in provinces unused to them, was a very long business, and might extend over many years. Tertullian says at the end of the second century, "it is certain, that under Augustus, censuses were held in Judea under Sentius Saturninus, in which anyone could investigate his descent." We have, then, evidence from other sources that a personal census, such as described by Luke, referring every Jew to his proper family and house, was really taken, and taken partly under Sentius Saturninus. Dr. Zumpt remarks, in confirmation of this, that there was in the year B.C. 10, a very special activity at Rome, in the direction of promoting provincial censuses. Sentius Saturninus was made governor of Syria B.C. 9, and was therefore very likely desired to take a census at once in the way most agreeable to the Jewish people, which would, doubtless, be one recognising their ancient tribal divisions, since the second census of Quirinius, which was conducted on the Roman principle and meant as a basis for a property tax, not for a poll tax, certainly did cause insurrection and disaffection. Dr. Zumpt conjectures that this first census taking, which must have been a very slow affair, if conducted on the tribal principle, indicated both by Luke and Tertullian, may easily have lasted five years, and have been completed only under Quirinius (whose "first census," it would then be called, in contrast to his second census, begun when he was for the second time made governor of Syria in A.D. 6). Sentius Saturninus was succeeded in the governorship of Syria by Quinctilius Varus in B.C. 6; and Dr. Zumpt supposes, that if the names of Joseph and Mary were registered in tables made under his rule, as Tertullian seems to have assented, the birth of Christ cannot have taken place later than B.C. 7. Dr. Zumpt confirms this by a learned and extended discussion of Luke's statement, as to the date at which John the Baptist entered on his ministry and as to the year of our Lord's death, which point, as he shows, to the year A.D. 26 for the former, A.D. 29 for the latter event. The numerous very learned details of the discussion we cannot go into: we have indicated the general purport of the book and given the leading conclusions, the many others—interesting and instructive to a bible student—all tend to prove the correctness of Luke's historical chronological notices; and further, in no mean degree confirm John's statement, that at the beginning of our Saviour's ministry in public, the building of Herod's temple had already gone on for forty-six years.

The practical value of the book, in its bearing upon the correctness of Luke's gospel, and the masterly manner in which historical evidences are discussed, with the marvellous amount of learning of value to every student of Roman history, makes Dr. Zumpt's book a work which all, who possibly can, should become acquainted with.

A.

“THE WANT OF THE AGE.”

“DEAD in trespasses and sins,” the great want of the age is *quicken*ing. The great question is—How shall these dead ones live? How shall the sleep of sin be broken, and the activities, which are now but the phantoms and nightmares of a dream, be made the harmonious and beautiful goings forth of a new and noble life? By having the breath of God breathed into them, in other words, by receiving the Spirit of the living God—the Holy Spirit. Again, How?—How shall they receive the Holy Spirit, unless they know there is a Holy Spirit awaiting their reception, in the way of God’s appointment? How shall they know except they hear; and who shall tell them but those who are already in possession?

We have preached the glad tidings. What are the results? Are they satisfactory—is the gathering abundant, in return for the seed sown? If not, why? In enforcing a divine lesson, one of old said, “For what is your life? It is even a vapour that appeareth for a little time and then vanisheth away.” But even the vapour comes not for nought. What then has been the *influence* of our life? Shall it in passing have left to the world, as a legacy, *the dew of life*, or the chill *damp of death*?

A greater than James said, “If any man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him; and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.” Do we so love? Is such our companionship? Let us be silent concerning the “Spirit that quickeneth,” until we make manifest that we are living in the fellowship of the Father and the Son, by the light ever burning—by the fruit with which our life is laden. The people of this age require proof of the reality, and worth of that, which we presume to offer them in the name of God—they need to see the volume of Christianity, illustrated by living photographs of Christ.

Behold! O ye saints of the Lord, the glory of your mission and destiny. Open the doors of your hearts, and keep them open; that the Lord may go in and out of His temples, and have pleasure therein

“Be not conformed to this world”—let not its grossness pollute your life, neither allow its narrow and selfish principles of business and expediency to twist your action into the thousand distortions of a mongrel religion; “but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind.” “Be followers of God as dear children.” “He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust.” Be like Christ—“My meat is to do the will of him that sent me”—“who went about doing good.” Let not the niggard be seen in you. Don’t allow any trade trickery, or mean catch-penny policy, to give a colour to your life; neither suffer a grinding acquisitiveness to stamp you with the seal of this gold-loving generation, and bring upon you the curses of the poor. Rather let the God, “who giveth richly and upbraideth not,” be your great ideal—Christ, who shed His blood for you, the pattern of every day.

While we review our past operations in preaching the gospel, and deliberate on plans for the future, let the great subject of church-culture have the consideration, which its imperative necessity and mighty importance demands. When the house is in order, then we may go forth into a wider field with confidence; and that order must consist, not only in the place, and observance, of special ordinances, but in the flow of a pure and unselfish life through the entire membership: when our wives present pictures of pure, honourable, fearless submission to the constituted head, guiding the affairs of the household with wisdom and economy;

when our husbands are noble embodiments of faithful, protective, cherishing love; when our children are patterns of obedience, and our fathers carry out a wise and pacific government; when our servants shall be prized for their faithfulness in all things; and our employers known as those who "give unto their servants that which is just and equal;" when "holiness unto the Lord" shall be the motto of every individual and the superscription at the threshold of all our homes; then shall we go forth accredited before men as the advocates of "a return to primitive Christianity." If we indeed possess, what perishing humanity needs, namely, the living and life-giving Spirit of God, and our own being has been so brought into harmony and unison with the mind of Christ, that our daily walk has become a continuous testimony to the fact, then the power of the head shall go forth from the members in a many-channeled stream of life, along whose course the sounds of penitent prayer and the songs of triumphant faith shall ever arise, to find their echo in the strains of angels, who strike their harps and sing, for the joy in their presence over returning prodigals.

If the foregoing be needful in the membership, what ought to be the position of overseers, deacons, teachers, exhorters, evangelists, and every other man who is called out to rule, guide, or represent "the Church of the living God—the pillar and ground of the truth?"

J. COLLIN.

Reviews, Notes, Passing Events, &c.

LIFE OF ELDER JOHN SMITH, WITH SOME ACCOUNT OF THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF THE CURRENT REFORMATION, BY J. A. WILLIAMS, PRESIDENT OF DAUGHTERS COLLEGE, HARRODSBURG, KENTUCKY. R. N. Carroll & Co., Cincinnati.

We wish our American brethren would leave off putting handles to the names of the Lord's servants. 'Elder' Smith and 'Deacon' Jones is not in accord with Bible style. Peter was an Elder, but who ever heard of *Elder Simon Peter*?

But what of the book? Why, every disciple should read it; and he who does so must be a strange cold-hearted creature if he is not made better by his reading. This book shows what a man, poor in this world's goods but rich in truth, uneducated in school learning but a master in scripture doctrine, can do in making many rich and wise to life eternal. Here a poor man, unaided by missionary societies, goes forth in the power of God, and, with marvellous self-sacrifice, aided by a

wife not less devoted than himself, changes the religious aspect of the district in which he moves.

Perhaps the best thing we can do is to continue this notice some two or three months, by allowing selections from its pages to speak for themselves.

The following may suffice for a commencement:

"When John was about nine or ten years of age, the school-master came along, and, arguing wisely at each fireside, made up a school of such children as could be spared from work, and indulged in the luxury of an education.

It should be remembered that teachers' wages, in those days, were not always paid in money. He ate from house to house; and the burden of keeping him was distributed among his employers. A roll of linsey, a few yards of tow linen, a woollen vest, a hank of yarn, or of thread, or of some

other product of the good wife's art, was often laid by as his stipulated hire. In the days of the old Franklin Commonwealth—the first State, by the way, west of the Allegheny Mountains that encouraged education by legislative action—even the Governor's salary was paid by the people, in such articles as linsey, raccoon skins, beeswax, and maple sugar; and though that Commonwealth had passed away, still in the Territory of Tennessee, as the country was now called, there was but little use for money. The school-master, too, was the last person in the country to refuse the bulky currency of the cabin, and to insist on gold and silver in payment for services that were regarded by many as useless to back-woodsmen.

John was permitted to lay aside his work—except on Saturdays—and was urged by his father to make good use of the present opportunity to get his schooling. On the appointed morning, with a spelling-book in his hand, and a piece of Johnny-cake in his pocket, he struck out a new path across the fields, and over the hills, to the newly raised hut of the master. It was, in fact, a hovel, built near a spring that bubbled up in the wild woods—a pen of unhewn logs, covered in with bark, or still rougher boards. A door had been made with a saw; and the crevices on all sides let in the light. The wind too, and the rain, and the snow, came in as freely; but a huge fire-place took up one end of the house, and log-heaps, piled on by the larger boys, and set afire every morning, tempered the weather within. When John came in on wintry mornings, wet with the chilling rain, and his brown face all aglow with cold, he would sit in his reeking linsey jacket before the roaring fire, and hum his task without complaining. His bench was the half of a riven sapling, raised on rude legs, with its splintered face turned up. Here sat a row of little boys with curving backs and swinging feet, and eyes that beamed all day long with fun or apprehension. His writing table was a long rough board that rested, with the proper slant, on stout pins driven into the wall, where the log had been sawed out to admit the light. Along this window sat another row of boys, and sometimes of girls, bending over spattered copy-books, or idly gazing into the woods without. Usually, the genius of Dilworth, and of Pike—sometimes of John Bunyan, supplied the frontier school with its text; and the low hum of the busy spellers, the clicking of the ciphering pencils, and the shrill voice of the solitary reader, as he stood before the master, kept up the lively discord till the sun went down. Sometimes the only reading book was the New Testament, John passed at once

from the dull columns of the spelling-book to the beautiful pages of the Evangelist. And as he learned to read the words, doubtless the influence of many a holy text fell unconsciously on his heart.

And the children of that day loved their humble school-house by the spring. An idler, or a truant was seldom seen among them. The first to get to school in the morning was the first to say his lesson. By a dozen different paths, through weeds, and brushy woods, the children every morning hurried on, careless of nuts, or birds, or flowers, each striving to be first in the race to school.

But the season for going to school was soon over; the busy seed-time came on, and the children were called to the fields. The scholars closed their books—the school-house was deserted—and the master went on his way, and was seen no more.

John Smith spent about four months at this, his first and for many years, his only school; but in that short period he learned to read. Beginning with the first letter of the alphabet, he passed through the spelling-book, and, at the end of the quarter, was a tolerable reader of the New Testament. The Good Book was sealed to him no longer. His father, anxious for his improvement, now enjoined it as a task upon him to read the Scriptures every Sunday. Nothing was further from his father's mind, however, than the thought that such reading would have any religious influence upon his child. He had no conception of any agency whatever, in the work of conversion, save the power of that Spirit which breathed where it listed. He would rather have withheld the Bible entirely from his boy, than the Spirit might work freely and sovereignly on his heart, than have grieved it away by the presumptuous attempt to give life by means of the word. He was wholly innocent of any religious aim when he required of John a lesson every Sunday. The Bible, however, was thus made his earliest reading-book; and it may be that some of its life-giving truth was appropriated by his own mind, even before the unction of the Spirit came upon him.

The people of the neighbourhood were pious, industrious, and rigidly Calvinistic. Holston Association, the oldest community of Baptists in the state, had been recently organized, and formally constituted on the Philadelphia Confession of Faith. One of the churches of this new connection had its place of meeting, not far from the cabin of George Smith, and as he was one of its most devoted members, the preacher, who came into the neighbourhood every month, was often a guest at his house. John, it is true, was still too young to hold, with distinctness, any article of a speculative faith;

but a young mind may be warped by doctrines before their formulas are comprehended. And surely, no theory of religious conversion was more likely to seize upon the imagination and heart of a child, than Calvinism, as it was understood and practically exhibited in our early Western churches.

A hell of the most appalling horrors, into which even little children might be cast—an unalterable destiny for every one, regardless of conduct or creed, as God might have chosen him for Heaven, or doomed him to hell before he was born—the dread uncertainty that rested on his fate—his utter inability to understand the Scriptures, to believe or to repent, to love God, or to obey him, until endued with power from on high—the necessity of some supernatural sign or sensation, some miraculous voice or vision as an evidence of pardon or acceptance with God; the recital of these strange experiences, as they were termed, to the breathless congregation or to the solemn group around the evening fireside; the musical voice of the preacher at meeting, beseeching with melancholy cant for sobbing penitents kneeling at the altar; the prayer of the almost despairing mourner, tossing on his bed at night, or, with strong crying and tears, agonizing alone in the depths of the forest; and still the exhortation, often repeated, to wrestle on till the blessing of the Spirit came, if, peradventure, it would come at all. All these and other phases of the early Calvinism, would strike with wonder and concern a thoughtful child even before he could read the Philadelphia symbol. And should

his own reason, or some text of Scripture, learned as a Sunday reading-lesson, suggest some other view of God or man, the anointed preacher was at hand, to rebuke the presumptuous thought, and save his young mind from every error.

John imbibed the temper of his fathers creed, as freely and unconsciously as he breathed the air upon his native hills. He soon began to wonder if the voice of the Holy Ghost would ever call to him; and he listened in the forest, when strange sounds were passing by, to hear his own name called by unseen lips. He wondered if some glorious vision would ever bless his eyes; and he peered into the evening shades for the spectral forms. Woods and streams and all solitary places, were in the dawn of his religious faith, the haunts of that mysterious Spirit that quickened the elect. He was not of course, in the language of the times, a seeker of religion, anxious and alarmed, and waiting for the gift of pardon. His conceit was not the offspring of a guilty conscience. It was the poetry of a dawning faith—a superstition, rather, devoid of either penitence or prayer. The stories of conversions that went round the neighbourhood, were always full of marvellous incident and spiritual adventure; and he listened to these narrations, as he listened to his mother's legends of the weird Banshee,—with simple wonder and a childish faith."

Here we leave John Smith, hoping the reader will meet him again next month.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND ITS COMPLETENESS. No. II.

THE LAST TWELVE VERSES OF MARK.

HAVING shown in a former article that the claim of the passage, Mark xvi, 9-20, to be a genuine portion of the original of that gospel, rests on authorities more ancient and more reliable than the oldest of the now existing Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, I must next proceed to show with some minuteness, what these authorities are, both that the reader may have the means of judging for himself in regard to their superior antiquity and reliability in comparison with the oldest Greek manuscripts used by Tischen-

dorf, in the Tauchnitz edition of the English New Testament; and that we may be able to use these authorities without further remark in reference to other passages omitted by Tischendorf. This is a subject quite new to the majority of our intelligent and well-educated readers, and the right principle of investigation should be settled at the outset of the discussion, and especially should the mind be disabused of the prejudice so natural to one who has not made this subject a special study, that the oldest existing Greek manu-

script of the New Testament is, of course, to be received as the highest authority for the text.

First authority, the old Syrian translation of the New Testament, called the Peschito, the *simple or common* translation.

This has been pronounced by competent scholars the very best translation of the New Testament that has ever been made in any language. The language itself is almost exactly the vernacular used by Christ and the apostles; it was the vernacular of most of the earliest Christian churches, as of that of Antioch, where the disciples were first called Christians, and where missionaries were first ordained to be sent to barbaric regions; and the translation itself dates back to the very apostolic period. It has been the uniform tradition of the Syrian Church that their translation was given them by the sanction of the apostle Thaddeus, and that it was made for them by Achæus, a disciple of Thaddeus, and that they had it in their churches many years before the close of the first century. Whether we are to receive this tradition as literally true in all its details may ever be doubted; but in the absence of all proof to the contrary, and with so much internal evidence in its favor, as to the main point of it, to wit, the apostolic antiquity of the work, we are perfectly safe within bounds in concluding that, at least, the historical books of the New Testament were in circulation in the Syrian churches in this Peschito translation as early as the latter part of the first century. If so, then the Syrian Christians, the near neighbours and contemporaries, and relatives by language and race of the apostles themselves, read this passage, the last verses of Mark's Gospel, without question, as a genuine portion of the Gospel of Mark, nearly three centuries before the oldest manuscript used by Tischendorf was written.

Now take this in connection with the fact that no one knows either the origin or the history of the Tischendorf manuscript, while both the origin and the history of the Syrian translation are known, and well attested as to substance, and also the fact that an accidental omission, especially of the last leaf, is much more easily accounted for than an interlined interpolation, which, at that early period and in those circumstances, would have been well nigh impossible, and any one can see that the authority of the Syrian translation must be, in this instance, altogether superior to that of the Greek manuscript.

To this add the authority on the same point of all the translations of the second and third centuries, and of more than five hundred Greek manuscripts, and the case is made out.

Second authority, Irenæus. He was born in Smyrna, near the beginning of the second century, was the student of Polycarp, the celebrated bishop and martyr of that city, the disciple of John the apostle, and not unlikely the very *angel* of that Church to whom John directed the epistle in Rev. ii, 8-17, dictated by the Lord Jesus. He had resided at home, and early went as a missionary to Lyons in France, where he suffered martyrdom in the year 202. In writing to a friend, Iconius, who was an Elder in the Church at Rome, he says:

"I saw thee when I was yet a boy in the lower class with Polycarp. I remember the events of those times much better than those of more recent occurrence. I can tell the very place where the blessed Polycarp was accustomed to sit and discourse of his familiar intercourse with John, as he was accustomed to tell, as also his familiarity with those who had seen the Lord. How also he used to relate their discourses, and what things he had heard from them concerning the Lord; also

concerning his miracles, his doctrine; all these were told by Polycarp, in consistency with the Holy Scriptures, as he had received them from the eye-witnesses. These things I attentively heard, noting them down in my mind; and these same facts I am always in the habit of recalling faithfully to mind."

These expressions of Irenæus I have somewhat abridged for the sake of limit, but I have carefully given the full meaning.

Is not Irenæus better authority on such a point as that which we are now considering, than an anonymous manuscript written nearly two centuries after his time? Yet Irenæus, in his great work on *Heresies*, iii., 10: 6, writes thus: Mark says in the end of his Gospel (Mark xvi. 19), "And indeed the Lord Jesus, after He had spoken to them, was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God."

The third authority, Hippolytus. Hippolytus was a scholar of Irenæus, the pastor of a Church in the neighbourhood of Rome, one of the most pious preachers and able writers of his time, and his works are still highly esteemed and widely read. In 1551, a statue of him with biographical inscriptions was disinterred near Rome, and in 1661 and

1832, important, long-lost writings of his were discovered, all of which excited great interest and enthusiasm. In his works on spiritual gifts there is this passage: "Jesus says to all at the same time, concerning the gifts which shall be given by Him through the Holy Spirit, 'and these signs shall follow them that believe,'" etc., etc., quoting the whole of Mark xvi. 17, 18.

We need pursue the subject no further, nor quote the later fathers, Augustine, Jerome, and others. So far as the weight of authority is concerned, is not the genuineness of the passage in question established beyond reasonable doubt? 'Tischendorf has no superior in regard to New Testament Greek manuscript authority; but as to the authority of translations, church writers, etc., which are more ancient than any of our New Testament Greek manuscripts, Lachmann is his superior, and Lachmann retains this passage as genuine. As to internal evidence, without these verses, how abrupt and awkward the closing words of the Gospel, "For they were afraid!" From the analogy of all the other Gospels, we could certainly expect something beyond this, and common sense would teach the same.—Prof. Stowe, D. D. *Christian Union*.

THE CENSUS—HOW SHALL THE CHURCH BE DESIGNATED?

Brother Evans has earned the gratitude of the brethren for his highly suggestive and interesting paper on the Designation of the Churches. Personally I thank him, for I have been greatly assisted to a conclusion by his vigorous breaking up of the ground, and I trust the brethren generally will have been stimulated to thought and examination, so that, when we meet in conference at our Annual Gathering, we shall have little difficulty in fixing

upon a truly scriptural and satisfactory name.

If the question in the Census should be put in the form: "Of what religious persuasion are you?" I suppose our brethren would agree to answer simply "Christian," or "I am a Christian"—adopting without hesitation the name borne by all the early Disciples. But if it stood thus: "To what religious society or denomination do you belong?" we should have to agree, not upon

an individual name, but upon one which would most scripturally and properly describe the ideal New Testament Church which we take as our only model—yet I would add in its relation, as far as consistent with scripture, to the age in which we live. But we are, in the meantime, somewhat at issue, for I am unable to accept the conclusion that we are shut up to the name “The Church of God” absolutely and exclusively, nor yet as a prevailing and distinguishing appellation.

I presume it will not be denied, as a matter of fact, that the Church is both the Church of God; and the Church of Christ: that the early Churches, if not so frequently called by one name as the other, were designated Churches of Christ and Churches of God; so that both these, as applied to the Church or Churches, may be put down as perfectly scriptural names.

The next proposition to which I would ask assent is one on which, I feel assured, the whole question rests. It is, that the *actual relationship* of either the Father or the Son to the Church determines far more the *right* to have the Church called by their names, than any number of times the names may stand recorded in such connection. In deciding *human* claims it sometimes happens that precedent, long usage, or the acknowledgement of right is every thing. It is not so in regard to the claims of God and His Christ over all that belongs to them. Their mutual ownership in, and relation to the Church are inalienable, and cannot be made to depend upon any amount of recognition, more or less. The right to have the Church called by either name, or both, is therefore unquestionable.

Of course our warrant for using either one name or the other is what we have to decide; and I have no doubt it will be at once admitted, that one clear instance of scripture mention is as good as a thousand, in

settling the simple question of authority or lawfulness of usage. In choosing, therefore, between two names, which, as authorized by scripture, are equally right in themselves, I cannot think we arrive at a sure result by merely counting up the number of occurrences and allowing the majority to carry the day. There may have been reasons for giving pre-eminence to one name above the other in the apostolic age, which are not in existence now. Let me ask; might it not become the duty of the Church, having regard to the honour of its Divine Headship, to proclaim and defend its union with the Father at one time, and with the Son at another, just as its union with the one or the other were called in question; and, if so, who will affirm that it has not become a necessity of the present time to give prominence, not to say the greater prominence, to the name of *Christ*, just as it did in the apostolic age to give prominence to the name of *God*? So impressed am I with a sense of this necessity, that, if we had but a bare *foothold* for the name of Christ, instead of ground as broad as the eternities, I should feel it our imperative duty in the service of the Truth to plant our feet firmly upon it at the present crisis. Through the whole of the apostolic age the right of the believer in Christ to be called a child of God was vigorously disputed, not only by God's ancient people, but by the heathens themselves. Whether the preponderance of mention arises out of this fact, or not, it is nevertheless true, that we have to meet, in this age, a current that is sweeping in an entirely opposite direction—one whose tendency is to make the name and spiritual Fatherhood of God so *universal* that, it is used to cover every conceivable aberration of religious thought and practice. Pantheism, Deism, Unitarianism, and recently a fresh import of pure Theism from India, fanned by the

fitful breath of English sectarianism, all uniting, as if by solemn league and covenant, to exclude the name of Christ from Divine ownership and authority in His own blood-bought Church—while they invoke and confess the name of God, as a Being near enough, and gracious enough, without a mediator, and without any atoning sacrifice. The danger of being found, even in appearance, in such company should suggest caution. It would be a pity if our zeal for primitive practice should blind us to the fact that, even apostolic example, when governed by surrounding circumstances, must yield in favour of other practice *if equally pure and right on scripture grounds*, when the condition of things requires its adoption.

In order to a more thorough examination of the subject, we might admit, that the argument founded on the preponderance of mention is the only correct test, the only real ground of authority. Then truth and consistency imperatively require that we should bring within the scope of our inquiry the larger question of *relationship*, and submit that, as well as the one of mere verbal description, to the measuring line; and, who will affirm that the relations of Christ to His Church, are not set forth in the apostolic writings with more emphasis, in a greater number of places, at greater length, with more minuteness of detail and vividness of description, than those which the heavenly Father sustains. Not that the relationship is less real, or perfect, in one case than the other, but simply on the ground on which we have accepted the issue, we say that, in the highest region, the more abundant and manifold mention is in favour of the Son, and that his claim should prevail in any inquiry, where the weight of mere numerical mention had to decide the question. Let any reader take the concordance and glance over the passages under the name "Christ." He will be

astonished at the glorious array of expressions and figures, used to set forth the relations that Christ sustains to the Church. I have only to call to remembrance some of these, such as His relation to the Church, as His Bride, His House, His Family, His Body, a Kingdom. Himself as a Vine, a Loaf, a Fountain, or Well of Water, a Rock, and the reader will acknowledge the minuteness, and pictorial vividness, with which Christ's union with, and proprietorship in, the Church are portrayed.

What then shall we say, but that the name of "Christ" must in no wise be excluded from any Inscription, we may write on the Church's portals, but receive all the prominence and honour we can pay to it. And what of the dear exalted name of our Father in Heaven? Does the acceptance of one adorable name necessarily exclude the other? By no means! There is in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians (ii. 14.) a name given by the apostle to the Churches in Judea, which includes both God and Christ, and which I think, we might safely adopt. It is eminently descriptive of the Church's true standing in its Divine Headship; it contains, as in a setting of gold, the prime elements of the Church's confession; and, as far as a name can go, will shed a clear and steady light all around. I would submit for the consideration of the brethren the name—"The Church of God in Christ Jesus."—G. Y. T.

Brother Hay is confident that what he wrote last month in review of my paper is right. He hopes that I may write and say so. I can only reply that the editorial which follows his review expresses my judgment so fully, that I can see but little more to say. It appears to me settled that the divine designation, "Church of God," is the one most often given, and is applied to the whole church, to a district of

churches, and to one church; hence it is convenient and suitable for broad or limited use: and it is also the chief of all designations, as has been fully proved.

No other names, given by the Holy Spirit to the church, are discarded, nor depreciated, but all are reverently maintained, each according to its legitimate usage: but the name of the Father ever has been, and ever will be, honored by precedence in the Church and Kingdom of God's dear Son.

God never did in any age of the world give to himself or to his people names on a par with other gods and peoples, merely to be distinguished from them as they were from each other. He and His congregation never were reckoned with the nations, nor with sects of any grade—I mean not in their royal congregational, or church capacity. This being true it follows that if we are of God we dare not assume any distinctive name, after the fashion of denominationalism, merely to distinguish one sect from another.

Respecting the designations "the Churches of Christ" and "Christian," I believe them to be equally divine as to origin. The Theistic Jew and the Polytheistic Gentile never manufactured either of these names for the church, neither did they apply the one or the other to the church with any sympathy with the true import of the terms, as that the church merited such names. The name Christ, or its equivalent Messiah, is as ancient as the prophets of the old covenant, and always has been an excellent name with the Jew and Gentile, and afterwards

with the Church of God. The name Christian simply grows out of union with Christ. Men became disciples of Christ, were "baptized into Christ," and "put on Christ." They were thus *Christed*, or made Christians, and were so called by the Holy Spirit. (1 Pet. iv, 16.) Disciples then are Christians on divine grounds only. They are, then, indebted to Christ for this excellent name, and not to their enemies as some suppose. The name Christ, or Christian, never was in itself a name of reproach. It never originated with the enemies of Christ, as a name in itself indicative of calumny or scandal. It was the supposed false assumption of the name that caused it to be used in the sense of reproach. Jew and Gentile supposed that Jesus of Nazareth, who claimed the name of Christ, was an impostor worthy of death, and that all who had (as above explained) put on His name were only wedded to a deceiver: so, in their estimation, the name was falsely assumed and dishonored: hence they could not apply it to Jesus and His followers in the excellency of its import, as an appropriate and "worthy name," but rather in the sense of false assumption, in the way of mockery or reproach; and as such they blasphemed it. If the foregoing thoughts are correct, then "externs" or "outsiders" in apostolic days, or in our days, are no guide in any way directly nor indirectly, in the selection of names for the church. Christ and His church alone, as found in the New Testament, we must copy and follow in this and in every other matter.

E. EVANS.

ADDRESS BY C. ABERCROMBIE.*

BRETHREN, it has been desired, and I suppose you expect that a brief history of the Church of Jesus Christ

in Morrisania—its past and present condition—be given on this occasion. In view of this desire and expectation

* Read at the opening of the Meeting House of the Church of Jesus Christ, in Morrisania, on the 26th of June, 1870.

I shall in few words present all I consider of importance to be known.

What happened before I came to Morrisania I shall leave to others. I have nothing to do with what happened then, although in a very important sense the condition of the church since then has been largely affected by that chapter of its history.

While I was in my own country, as an evangelist, proclaiming from place to place the good news, my brother wrote to me telling me of the church in Morrisania, and stating that it was in want of a preacher.

Having a desire to return to America for my family's sake—one of which had gone out two years before,—this information was not without its influence in causing me to decide. Having made up my mind to leave my native land and field of labour as an evangelist I took ship, and by the grace of God was landed safe on these shores in the month of November, in the year of our Lord, 1868. I found the brethren meeting in the Odd Fellows' Hall, and not in such a satisfactory condition as I would have liked to have found them. 1.—They were very much disorganized, *i.e.*, while it could be said of some "these are members of the church," of others it could not be so said; and yet they met, and continued to meet, for the breaking of the loaf on the "First day of the week," and seemed as much related to the church as those who claimed relation thereto. They would not, however, allow themselves to be addressed as members. This state of things, in a limited sense, remains as I found it. 2.—They practised "open communion," *i.e.*, they gave the bread and the cup to all who would take them from the Deacons' hands. I am happy to say that that evil has been removed; so that, excepting in one or two cases, it has not been repeated for months past. My conviction is it never will be again—at least I hope so. 3.—They gathered money from those

who were not members of the body of Christ. They have done so up to this day, notwithstanding my repeated protests against it as an act unsanctioned by the Redeemer or by His Apostles, and as an attempt to compromise the position of the Saviour's kingdom, which He said "is *not* of this world." I hope, however, we have seen the end of that. 4.—The eldership was deficient. That, however, has been put on a scriptural basis, and therefore on that point the church is right.

Since my connection with the church here, we have met twice every first day of the week—excepting when prevented by the inclemency of the weather. In the morning, the brethren were generally in their places to break bread; but in the evening our meetings have been very discouraging—partly because of brethren being absent, partly from the fact that we met in a Hall, and partly, no doubt, from other causes.

Notwithstanding all these discouragements the brethren have kept together, and additions have been made. Because of removals, however, our number has not increased much, if any. Some of the brethren were resolved that by the help of the Lord, the church in Morrisania should not go down; and they have proved themselves in earnest by the efforts they have made; efforts, which have not been ineffectual as facts do show: for to the extent of their ability have they contributed to defray the necessary expenses of the church. I do not say that all have done so; hence, therefore, the weight has lain heavier on the few. For my own part I have done as much as I could—yea more than I could, had it not been for my family. While at home I was comfortably maintained by the churches there—right down to the moment of my leaving Scotland for America. Since my connection with the church here—about nineteen months—in view of its necessities I

have laboured almost gratuitously. Nevertheless the brethren have given me and mine repeated evidences of Christian love, above and beyond expectation considering their number and means; so if my brethren have done what they could to maintain the church in Morrisania, I claim that I also have a right to a share in the honour. The past, brethren, has been a period of sacrifice, of self-denial. May the reward in the future be the increase and stability of the church here! The battle has been so far fought, and a victory has been achieved. We meet no longer in Theatres and Odd Fellows' Halls. The Church of God in this place has now a meeting house in which to worship Him through our Lord and Saviour, Jesus the Christ.

I cannot close without recording my grateful heartfelt thanks to the Father of our Lord that one brother of the church in New York has by building and furnishing this house of worship, given evidence that he understands to a certain extent the doctrine of that remarkable saying of the Apostle—"Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich yet for your sakes He became poor that ye, through His poverty, might be rich."

One more word and I have done. Seeing that now the church in Morrisania is so far freed from her troubles, and seeing that she is now in a condition to make herself felt in the district as a power for good, it might be well that she look out for a preacher, better fitted for the work, and more qualified to take advantage of the present opportunities for good, than I am or have been.

Should the church come to this conclusion I shall willingly give place to the man of their choice, and devote my efforts henceforth to some other field.

C. A.

P.S.—After the reading of the above Br. C. C. Foote of New York followed with a discourse on the dedicating of houses of worship, in which he said he saw a resemblance between dedicating houses and the old practice of house-warming. He also favoured us with a rendering of that well-known saying of Br. T. Campbell—"Where the Scriptures speak we speak. Where the Scriptures are silent we are silent." Which to my mind was rather original. He exemplified as follows:—"There are many churches of the Brotherhood which are almost rent to pieces on the organ question. Now, said he, the Bible—he meant the New Covenant Scriptures—is perfectly silent on that subject, it ought, therefore, to be let alone. So thought I. He meant, however, that brethren who elect that the organ shall be introduced should not be opposed, and that when it had got in—they have one in New York—there should not be a word of complaint; because—'Where the Scriptures speak, we speak. Where the Scriptures are silent we are silent.' Again, if people shall prefer to *sit* during prayer with their heads bent down, rather than to stand or kneel, no one should object, because—'Where the Scriptures speak,' &c. You have read or heard perhaps a saying to this effect—'silence is consent.' Mr. F. acted, in my judgment upon that, and not upon the saying of T. Campbell.

I thought of the example of Jesus, of the Apostles and first Christians and wondered. Could it be possible that he had come to consider example as no guide? If so, then farewell our authority for meeting on the "First day to break bread," &c., because we meet not then by command, but by example. He concluded by exhorting the brethren to have kind feelings towards the other denominations, and not to forget that our specialty is to unite Christians of the other denominations. But this we could not do, said he, were there are no Christians in the other denominations.

Altogether it was a very *pleasing* discourse and was considered so by one at least, as I have learned since its delivery. My ideas of these things are different and they have not been changed by that discourse.

We have as yet no organ. When it comes in (should it ever do so, which I hope not) I go out. I intend to abide by the old fashioned rendering of that saying of T. Campbell "Where the Scriptures," &c., whether by doing so I should please or displease.

C. ABERCROMBIE.

CO-OPERATION MEETING—SCOTLAND.

THE Annual Meeting of Brethren in Scotland was held in Watt Hall, Dundee, on the 11th of July. There were present Bren. I. K. Tener, Moree, Ireland, Somerville, Aitken, Pillaus, Paton, and Wishart, from Edinburgh; Linn and Young from Glasgow; Forsyth and Robertson from Auchtermuchty; Harrow and Melville from Pathhead; Penman from Crossgates; Evangelists Hurt, Strang, Rae, and Scott, and others, with a number of Dundee Brethren. I. K. Tener was called to the chair. The Secretary then read the Annual Report, which set forth—

"DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN,—Again, through the mercy of our Heavenly Father, we are permitted to appear before you, to give some account of the Lord's work in our midst. It is still true, as in the days of our blessed Lord, that 'The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few.'

We have had two Evangelists in the field, Bros. Rae and Scott, who have been labouring fervently for you. Br. Rae, as you are aware, is principally attached to Dundee Church, but has also laboured with success in Dunfermline, Crossgates, Armadale, &c., and has helped to build up these Churches. Br. Scott was engaged for nine months, which he spent nearly as follows, viz.: two months at Aberdeen, under somewhat inauspicious circumstances; also a short time in Glasgow; and a length of time in Sanquhar. He likewise visited Crofthead and Armadale, where the Brethren were cheered by his warm-hearted addresses. He has been engaged preaching along the Banffshire coast for the last two months, where we understand his labours have been much appreciated. Our distinctive principles are becoming better known than they have hitherto been, and are commending themselves to right-hearted men, who honestly desire to walk in the fear of the Lord, and serve Him through Jesus in the way appointed. We are sure that the New Testament principles we profess would greatly spread were the Brethren who form the membership of our Churches fully to realize their obligations to Jesus, and what their profession requires of them. Their profession requires that they give a reason for the hope that is in them, with meekness and fear, and that they live quiet and

peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty. That they be living epistles of God, known and read of all men. We profess to come before God through the blood of Jesus without the intercession of anyone. We take high ground. How do we fulfil the expectations we have raised? Are we more ardent in the cause of the Redeemer? Do we seek more than other professors to teach men the way of salvation? Is it the all-absorbing object with us to induce men to accept the gospel of Jesus Christ in its purity and love, and live simply as Christians, that in the end we may attain to the crown which fadeth not away? Brethren, these are serious questions, worthy of our deepest consideration.

It has long been the opinion of your Committee that each Church should be a centre of Evangelistic labour, and ought to exert a lively influence on the surrounding district by keeping up a regular supply of preaching Brethren able to make the name of the Lord known. This can only be done by the several Elders and office-bearers going more heartily into the work than they have hitherto done, and with this view employing a suitable Evangelist to look after Visitation, Prayer Meetings, and other matters connected with the organization, which they cannot possibly overtake. Were this suggestion carried out we would have Edinburgh, Dundee, Glasgow, Banff, and possibly other towns, as centres of Evangelization, and thus relieve the Committee from much unnecessary labour.

In presenting you with our Annual Financial Statement, you will note that the amount collected during the year is £193 7s., being less than the previous year by £70 3s., which difference is accounted for by the following churches having given no subscription during the past year, viz.: Edinburgh, Dalkeith, and Findochty, and the amount contributed by the Church in Glasgow being diminished. We do not think that the diminished receipts indicate any want of zeal amongst the Brethren who formerly contributed, but arises from the fact of your Committee not being able to bring suitable labourers into the field, and having already sufficient funds to provide for those presently employed, more did not seem to be needed. We are quite satisfied that were we able to find suitable labourers, that the Churches generally would contribute willingly.

In conclusion, Brethren, can we sit down with indifference when we see thousands of our countrymen living in open rebellion to

the King of kings. Let us cry night and day to the Almighty to animate the hearts of his believing people to greater zeal, greater love, greater prayerfulness, greater self-denial, and more earnestness in persuading men to flee from the thralldom of Satan and accept of salvation through the blood of Jesus Christ."

The Report, with the Cash Statement appended, was adopted, the amount received being £274 7s. 11d., and the sum expended, £177 3s. 6d., leaving a balance in hand of £97 4s. 5d. The Brethren in Edinburgh have sustained an Evangelist for themselves during the past year.

Bros. Scott, Rae, and Hurt responded to an invitation to give an outline of their labours, and Br. Strang gave an interesting account of his labour during the year in England. Reports from delegates were also received, by which it appeared that—

The Church in Edinburgh numbers 180. Br. Hurt has been very much appreciated; he follows up house to house visitation, visits the neighbouring towns and villages, and his meetings are well attended. Brethren are engaged in Sunday School teaching, and Br. Hurt conducts a Lord's Day morning class, and the various agencies of the Brethren are prosperously put forth.

The Church in Glasgow numbers about 170 members. Twenty-four baptisms have taken place during the year. Things are very encouraging. They bless the Lord for their measure of success.

The Church in Dundee has made but little progress during the year, having come through severe trials. At present they are more united and better able to contend for the faith than for some time past.

Reports were also given in from Auchtermuchty, Crossgates, Dunfermline, Pathhead, indicating faithful adherence and disposition to contend for the truth.

Br. Rae stated that he could only engage for three months. The engagement of Br. Scott was left in the hands of the Committee.

It was next moved that the Glas-

gow Committee carry on the work for another year, and unanimously agreed to.

Br. Miller, Dundee, in a lengthened speech, made the following suggestions with regard to the training of young Brethren for the work, viz.: "1. That it is the duty of each Church to train up one or two Brethren as teachers of the Word.—2. When an Evangelist may not be present to encourage them in the work, the Elders should look after this duty.—3. That all Class Books be furnished free.—4. That a Committee be appointed to receive and distribute funds."

Br. Aitken, Edinburgh, made some remarks on the necessity for the Brotherhood all taking the same distinctive name in the forthcoming census of 1871. It was unanimously agreed, that this Meeting recommend the English Brethren when assembled at Newcastle, that the name "Christian" should be the designation of the Brethren throughout the kingdom.*

Br. Harrow, Pathhead, made an appeal on behalf of the Building Debt of the Chapel. It was proposed by Br. Selbie, Dundee, in consideration of the exertions made and being continued by Brethren in Pathhead to reduce their debt, that the Brethren present be recommended to mention their case to the various Churches, with a view to sending such assistance as they can.

It was then agreed, that the next Annual Meeting be held in Edinburgh—time to be fixed by the Committee. The Secretary read a letter from Brethren in Banff, requesting Evangelistic assistance, and a vote of thanks was passed to

* There is not, that we know of, any intention to hold an Assembly of English Brethren in Newcastle, nor anywhere else. The Newcastle Meeting is the General Annual Meeting for England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. It is this year to be held in Newcastle, to the great inconvenience of the English Brethren generally, for the purpose of affording facilities for Scotch Brethren to be present in larger numbers than if more distant. Schedules are sent to all Churches, of the Primitive Order, in the United Kingdom, willing to fill and return them.

The recommendation to the General Meeting to adopt the name *Christian*, we think good, so far as the designation of individuals is concerned, but not as the name of the Church. *Christian Church* is un-scriptural. *Christian* is never used as an adjective, qualifying a congregation. *Individuals* are *Christians*—we read of the *Church of God, of Christ, and of His Church*, but never of the *Christian Church*. Let us fix upon a strictly Scriptural name for the Church.—Ed.

the Committee and Br. Tener for their services.

The meeting was very harmonious and pleasant, and afforded us an opportunity of hearing each other's experience and difficulties in carrying on the Lord's work. It is pleasant to reflect that well-directed perse-

vering effort has met with a large measure of success to the praise of our Heavenly Father. In the evening a Tea Meeting was held, at which stirring addresses were delivered by Bros. Aitken, Somerville, Hurt, and Strang. The choir discoursed excellent music. A. Y.

ARRIVAL OF W. HINDLE.

MELBOURNE, VICTORIA, May 21st, 1870.
—Dear Br. King,—I want my Brethren at home to join with me in thanksgiving and praise to our Heavenly Father for His protection and care over us while sailing over the mighty deep, and for bringing us to this city, after a splendid passage of fifty-five days, being the quickest passage that the "Great Britain" has ever made. About two hours after we dropped anchor in the Hobson's Bay, Bro. Shaw came on board, and in a short time my two companions, Bros. Robert Hindle, and John Ball, from Blackburn, were comfortably lodged in the House of Bro. Geddes, while myself and son were kindly entertained by Bro. and Sister Shaw, in their quiet retreat at Balaclava, five miles from the city.

We have all received a very kindly welcome, and, as far as we can see, there is plenty of room for earnest workers, both in the fields and in the vineyard of the Lord, for it is true of this Country as well as England, that the harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few. Oh that Christians everywhere would live near to the Lord, and daily and hourly shew forth the praise of Him who has called us out of the darkness, into his marvellous light! Will the brethren in Great Britain excuse the shortness of this letter, and if the Lord permit, I will try to make up for it in my next. Brethren pray for me, I need an interest in your prayers. With kindly love to all, I remain, yours truly in the Lord,

W. HINDLE.

STATISTICS OF AUSTRALIAN CHURCHES FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 1ST, 1869.

Situation of Church.	Present No. of Members.	Additions during the year.	Deaths.	Transferred to Sister Churches.	Separated.	Sunday School Teachers.	Sunday School Scholars.
SOUTH AUSTRALIA.							
Adelaide, White's Room	235	216	1	8	0	20	153
Alma Plains	56	4	0	3	2	6	42
Hindmarsh	237	55	1	15	11	18	130
Milang	47	72	0	23	2	7	46
Point Sturt	61	5	0	19	2	10	52
Port Adelaide	9	9	0	0	0	0	0
Stirling East	59	20	2	5	1	6	48
Strathalbyn	36	36	0	0	0	6	52
Two Wells	42	25	0	8	0	7	30
Willunga	53	53	0	0	0	0	0
VICTORIA.							
Bellarat, Mechanic's Institute	80	14	0	3	0	7	—
Bellarat, Dawson Street	48	16	0	6	1	7	50
Bonamaris	93	17	0	6	1	9	80
Brighton	36	6	1	5	1	3	15
Lygon Street, Carlton, and Smith Street, Collingwood	740	196	6	40	21	39	330
Manchester Unity Hall, Melbourne	86	8	0	4	0	12	110
Mount Clear, near Ballarat	27	2	0	0	1	6	44
Pakenham	15	5	0	0	0	3	15
Prahran	154	54	1	15	2	12	110
Richmond	58	46	0	0	0	7	40
Wedderburne	27	0	0	0	1	4	20
NEW ZEALAND.							
Dunedin	141	87	1	5	4	9	70
Spring Grove	50	5	1	3	4	0	9
Wellington	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYDNEY.							
New South Wales	115	74	0	2	3	14	100

The above is not the statistics of all the churches; some having failed to send a report.—From *Australian Pioneer*.

ITEMS OF NEWS.

MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA.—Another labourer in the person of Bro. Hindle, from England has just been added to our staff of Evangelists. He arrived safely a few days ago. There is a wide field, and a fair prospect of the cause being greatly advanced throughout the various districts of this colony.

We have now six brethren entirely devoted to the work, and as many young men under training, with a view to enter the same field. A great work can be accomplished, if the brethren now realise their obligations, liberally to contribute to the support of those thus engaged in this, the greatest of all enterprises.

It is true that there are many obstacles, but these must be met and overcome. Truth is mighty, and the gospel is powerful in bringing down the strongholds of sin and Satan. Believing the cause is the cause of truth and of God, we hold that it must and will prevail, therefore we labour in faith. We may never again see such rapid progress, as took place under the early labours of Bros. Earl and Surber, but if there is a steady and continuous progress, we ought to be thankful. Very few weeks pass without some being added to the Church, under the preaching of Bros. Surber and Carr, in Lygon Street, and Forresters Hall, Smith Street.

A. THOMSON.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.—We have just bid adieu to Bro. Strang, after six months labour among us. He has gone to Scotland, to visit his family, and attend the annual meeting there, after which he returns to Blyth, where he intends to labour until the annual meeting here. While our brother has laboured here, seven have been baptized, and (together with three others baptized elsewhere) added to the Church. We cannot speak too highly of his labours. For a considerable part of the time he had, every week, two cottage meetings in different parts of the town, open to all, and a Bible class in the vestry, intended especially for our own young men, in addition to the regular Lords-day services and Wednesday evening meeting, in our own Chapel. Inquirers also were diligently sought out and instructed at their own homes, or invited to his lodgings, so that besides his

more public efforts, he bestowed much labour in preaching and teaching from house to house. The members of the Church too had a share of his attention. Though he could by no means be induced to occupy any position which might merely appear to belong to another, still he was always willing to assist the officers of the Church, in any part of their work, while he could do so without neglecting his own. His public preaching has been very acceptable, clear, sound, earnest, and practical, whether hearers were prepared to obey or not, they generally carried home a conviction that he had the truth on his side. His manly, judicious, and impartial admonitions in the Church, too, some of us, will long remember, we trust, with gratitude in our hearts. Our prayer is that many such labourers may be thrust out into the vineyard of the Lord, and that the brethren may see it to be a privilege to sustain them there.

J. MOFFITT.

July 8th 1870.

MANCHESTER.—We have just had a visit from Bro. D. King, extending to two weeks. The chapel proved too small, and people had to go away unable to get in on some of the week nights. The Lords-day evening meetings were also crowded. It was deemed advisable to devote his discourses chiefly against Secularism, as the Secular Lecture Room, is directly opposite the Chapel. There was considerable discussion after the lectures, several expressed themselves confirmed in the faith, young disciples were instructed, and Secularists made to feel and acknowledge the poverty of their system.

RATCLIFFE.—Bro. Strang, spent a week here. One was baptized. We express our thanks for his labours. R. H.

LINCOLN.—The Church has been increased by the addition of two, one of whom was immersed on the 19th of June, and the other on the 17th of July. T. B.

WHITEHAVEN.—Dear Bro. King, we are happy to say that since you left us, last month, four have been immersed and added to the Church.

BIRMINGHAM.—During the last month, several have been immersed.

DEBATE—KING AND BRADLAUGH.

A public discussion has been agreed upon by D. King and C. Bradlaugh, to be held in Bury, Lancashire, on September 27, 28, 29, 30, and October 26, 26, 27, 28, 29. The Co-operative Hall is taken for the purpose. The Subjects are—1. What is Christianity? 2. Is it of Divine Origin? 3. What are its Legitimate Effects? 4. What is Secularism, and what can it do for Man that Christianity cannot? 5. Is the Bible Account of Creation opposed to Reason and Science?

A PAGE OF HISTORY AND A LINE OF REVELATION.

THE writer of *Ecce Homo*, whatever may be said of the book, has certainly impressed upon the reader, with unwonted power, one thought, that the knowledge of God and the spread of Christ's kingdom is in itself, as a vast whole, a far greater marvel than the physical miracles wrought by his personal power or in the apostolic age.

With the combined assistance of reason and revelation, it is difficult even yet to understand that from the highest round of human intelligence we can catch no glimpse of God, yet from the lowest round may touch the hem of His garment who goes before us into heaven.

Craving pardon for the sake of the motive, let us lay all reverence aside, put the miracles out of sight, and make a legend of the resurrection and a fable of the flaming Pentecost. The infidel is now satisfied; and we can view what remains together. We see a harmless wanderer, an ambitious man, always talking of himself, and yet with strange impolicy always offending his most influential friends, and at last dying a violent and shameful death, followed by only a few half-faithful Galilean fishermen.

And yet, eighteen hundred years after, this man, who has been dead for so many centuries, is an acknowledged power in every enlightened nation on the face of the whole earth. And this power unsupported, except by the memory of its dead author, and without the conscious volition of the mass of men, lives in our language, animates our literature, moves in our senates, controls in our laws, and moulds our peoples; and, whether we will or not, it is the great engine of progress, bearing the long train of civilization over the track of human destiny.

It is all this, and no man can tell why. We strip Christ of his divinity, and deny every miracle, and yet denuded of all he himself stands a greater miracle than all we have swept away.

Men may reject him. They do. But no enthusiasm haloes them, no power opposes, for Christianity is aggressive, not defensive, and right and left the stream divides and leaves them standing like pillars of salt all along the way between the Sodom of the world's wickedness and the purest civilization contemplated by the closest followers of Christ.

To those who read the pages of the world's history side by side with the revelations of God, the whole story of mankind from Eden to Mount Sinai, from Canaan to the Cross, all down the torpid centuries until now, are but a sermon on the text, "The world by wisdom knew not God." Egypt, Greece, and Rome, and China with her thirty centuries of civilization, borne not as a light ahead, but a burden in the rear of the march of nations, all proclaim it true.

But lest the bewildered eyes of men should fail to read aright so vast a page, it would seem as if Divine Providence had massed the elements of human wisdom and folly to epitomize this truth in the tragic burlesque of a day. The stage was France. Long years of political and religious corruption had prepared an applauding audience, and in 1793 and 1794 was enacted the most grotesque tragedy that the world ever saw.

If we desire to measure the heights and depths of human depravity, we may sink our plummet here, where wickedness became frenzy and infidelity enthusiasm, and where even the master-minds of the French Revolution, from the heights of reason, education, and refinement, alternately ignore, insult, and patronize their Maker.

It was just after the execution of Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette, when, as William Howitt says, "France was one great mad-house of

bloody, raving maniacs." The throne was gone. The church, which had sailed from Jerusalem with its snow-white banner, to be the ark of the world in every deluge of distress, had mutinied long ago, and now, sailing under the flag of Rome, foundered on the rocks of the French Revolution.

And now we have before us the strange spectacle of France, an enlightened nation, without a government, a religion, or a church, but with the legislative power vested in the hands of the wisest men in France; men, too, who were pouring out in impassioned sentiment their love of liberty, justice, and virtue. The world looked on. What would these wise men do? There was no law to compel, no religion to restrain, no church to hinder. Above the waste of what had been and was not, they had absolute power to will and to do. They might decree, and no man reverse; they might build, and no man pull down.

They held in their hands the experience of the past, the wisdom of the present, and the revelation of the future; nor were they blind to the hour. Beholding the grand possibilities before them, they believed themselves standing on a modern Sinai to give laws to a waiting people. But they invoked not God, but Reason, and a cloud passed before their eyes hiding the Lord from their sight. Rousseau, Voltaire, Talleyrand, and Mirabeau had prepared France for Anacharsis Clootz, who, at the head of a party, now appeared before the Convention, proclaiming the necessity of "destroying all the pretended sovereigns of earth and heaven." "There is," said he, "no other God but Nature, no other sovereign but the human race; and Nature kneels not to herself." And yet in the next act we see that Nature did kneel to herself, when the busts of Mirabeau, Marat, and other apostles of the republic were put in the place of the images of saints to be worshipped in the churches. Clootz claimed that by dethroning God as they had already dethroned their king, they would abolish together all necessity for taxes, public officers, or executioners, while Reason would unite them in a common brotherhood. The Convention received this impious proposition with transport. Gobel, Archbishop of Paris, after some hesitation, not of conscience but of caution, was decided by the more courageous conduct of Parens, a country curé, and appeared at last in his pontificals, followed by many of his clergy, and exchanged his mitre for a red night-cap. Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun, with a host of others, followed, and then the Commune joined the popular tide and renounced Christianity for the worship of Reason. On the 10th of November, amid a wild orgie of sentimental frenzy, the Convention and the assembled multitude formally deposed the Almighty, and set up to be worshipped in his stead a goddess of Liberty and Reason. The scene of this unparalleled mockery was the Church of Notre Dame. An opera-girl served for a goddess to receive the worship. Howitt says "it was a genuine theatrical scene burlesquing scandalously the rites of religion." To the true worshipper walls are not sacred things, and nothing holy can ever be actually profaned; but the Church of France had taught a different doctrine, and in reading the record of this crazy jubilee one feels a vague kind of disbelief that these men could so soon have outgrown every vestige of respect for a place whose very threshold they had once considered holy. True, they had burned the Pope in effigy, but the Pope had withstood them. It would seem that God himself must have chosen to utterly desecrate those silent incense-saturated walls, so stained by a polluted worship; and the purple and fine linen with which for ages men had veiled the eyes of men, and covered out of sight the ark of His holy covenant, were now thrown out to become the filthy rags of the revolution. They altered the

computation of time, and dated not from the birth of our Saviour, but from the 22nd of September, 1792, the birth-day of French liberty. After changing the names of the months, they divided them into periods of ten days instead of weeks: less kind to themselves and each other than God had been, they robbed man and beast of one day of rest in every month; and every decade they met to worship Liberty and Reason, professing to rise above every form of ignorance, injustice, and fanaticism, to become a loving brotherhood with their republic for their religion. But the guillotine was their altar, and their religion was blood.

While they were drenching their land with blood, this nation of maniacs seem to have had but one other desire—to wipe out, if possible, the very idea of God and a hereafter. For this purpose Fauché and Chaumette carried the work into the cemeteries, and destroyed or obliterated every emblem or inscription presenting the idea of God or immortality, and placed over the gates the words, "Death is eternal sleep." If it were ever permitted us to pray for the dead, human charity would constrain us to pray that they might have found it so—

"For e'en the dread power of dissolving in space
Would be bliss to *such* souls."

It is impossible for these men to take shelter in the heathen's refuge. Mercy spreads no shadowy wings of ignorance over the crimes of their lives which prepared the horrors of their death. They stood amid the "nations that forget God," and defiantly working out for themselves the companion character, they invoke the fate of both. The bloody and impious abominations of the "Reign of Terror" were not committed, or, at least, not directed, by an uneducated mob, but by men who were the lights of France, the friends of Talleyrand, Mirabeau, and Paine, the latter of whom was all this time sitting quietly in prison writing his "Age of Reason," perhaps an unconscious rival of the arch-fiend who outside his prison walls was writing down *his age of reason* in bloody columns in the book of time. It is difficult to believe that less than a century ago, with even human reason for a guide, men could have transformed civilized France into this fiendish chaos of confusion, carnage, and terror, destroying alike the republic and its foes, and even forcing each other under the uplifted axe of doom. When we think of Paris weltering in blood, of Nantes breeding pestilence from the stench of its victims, of the Loire bridged with its floating corpses we sink down in helpless agony and shame, and lay our human reason, at the feet of God, imploring him to save us from ourselves. We read of the butcheries of India, and the cold-blooded sacrifices of the Hindoos, and thank God that we live in a civilized land, and have heard the name of Christ; and yet in France, where the sacred symbols of the body and blood have told the story of the cross for centuries, we find the most cultivated minds planning and executing atrocities on a scale that finds no parallel among the South Sea Islanders or the brutal tribes of Central Africa. And all this in the name of human liberty and reason. Human Liberty! a virago with her cap dyed red in the purest blood of France, instead of a white-robed angel on the walls of Zion. Human Reason! a drunken despot enthroned upon a guillotine, instead of a Paul on Mar's hill.

If, in the wise economy of God, this sanguinary chapter serves any purpose, it must be to show to the world, for all time to come, how unutterably low they fall who make a god of Reason.

Nor was the carnage of this frenzied Age of Reason the sum of its crimes; that was only the outward and visible sign, written in blood, of

that abomination of desolation which swept away a polluted religion and a prostituted Church, and put in their place the flowers of Mirabeau and the logic of Paine, while in and out among them glided that old serpent whose sting is death.

And if the blood of the revolution rose above the high-watermark of human fury, it was not so much the intention of its leaders; still less the crime of a brutal mob resisting political tyranny; it was rather the legitimate result of a corrupt Church on one hand, and, on the other, the teachings of men who had long dethroned God in their hearts, and now sought to lay profane and violent hands upon his earthly sceptre.

Liberty and Reason were enthroned, but insanity and terror reigned, and this wild flood of human disaster drowned alike the bodies and the souls of men, sweeping away the bulwarks of religion and the landmarks of law.

And now high over this chaos sat the great Robespierre, great even in his littleness. The thunders of Danton were silenced, and Robespierre, enthroned in terror, sat alone—triumphant, calm, satisfied? Triumphant, certainly, but neither calm nor satisfied. It would seem that in the blackest human heart God never leaves himself without a witness; and so this human fiend, who more than all others had trampled humanity and outraged Divinity, was made the vindicator of that God to whom his whole life was an insult. He had conquered all opposition; his delicate white hands were the levers of the republic; his word was the axe of the guillotine; but above and before him frowned the shadow of death. He could not destroy that. It did not oppose him; it only waited for him—why did it wait? His compatriots had said death was an eternal sleep—had he not sent them, by hundreds, to prove it? Yet he had not affirmed it—if it were that, he was not ready to fall into its arms. Why did it wait? Was he not master of France? And so Robespierre, the most pitiful coward of the revolution, at last dared the loud wrath of this insane reign of reason, rather than the silent curse of God dethroned. Cautiously, at first, in the Jacobin club, he asserted, in view of the ungovernable excesses of the people, that “if there were no God, a wise legislature would invent one” to restrain them. Finding this speech well received by a majority, he next denounced the extreme atheists, and finally appeared before the Convention with a carefully prepared paper, deifying Liberty, Virtue, and Reason, and echoing all the putrid sentiment of the republic; and then, having sacrificed unto the gods of Canaan, he proceeded to argue the necessity for a belief in a Supreme Being, not as an undeniable truth, but as a theorem tending to the solution of their political problem, which was already beginning to startle even their callous hearts by its vast proportions and the awful momentum of its unmanageable elements. He asserted nothing, but endeavored to prove the advantage to be gained by assuming the existence of Deity. “The belief,” concluded Robespierre, “in a Supreme Being, and the immortality of the soul, is a perpetual recall to justice; it is, therefore, social and republican.”

Had he exorcised the shadow, or did it still wait? And now the noble senators, who in the cathedral of Notre Dame dethroned the Almighty amid the acclamations of the people, received this speech with the same demonstrations, and the people voted addresses to the Convention, thanking them for the restoration of the Supreme Being.

It would seem that such impiety must appear almost too weak to be wicked in the estimation of Him who is “the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.” But this was the wisdom of France; and as Robespierre said the people

needed festivals, they decided that every decade throughout the year should be a festival in honour of something—the human race, patriotism, liberty, virtue, agriculture, and a long list of abstractions; but the first was dedicated to the Supreme Being, as though He, too, were but an abstraction. "It hardly appeared," says the historian, "a restoration at all, but the erection of a pantheon of worshipable things, with the Supreme Being at the head of them."

The first festival, that of their reinstated Deity, was appointed for the 8th of June, or the 20th of Prairial, according to the new computation. Great preparations were made, and again blood-stained, woe-begone Paris forgot its aceldama for a few brief hours to thrill with a new sensation.

In the garden of the Tuileries a large mound was raised for the festival, and graced with three statues, Atheism, Deism, and a veiled statue of Wisdom. But the mound, erected in haste, proved too small to afford standing-room for the Convention, and the rites began amid much elbowing and cursing among that noble body.

As high-priest of the Supreme Being stood Robespierre, with torch in hand, awaiting the moment of the unveiling of the statue of Wisdom to set fire to the statues of Atheism and Deism. Here, standing upon the mound above the heads of Paris, just as he towered over France, we take our last look at Robespierre the great; the shadow is closing round him, henceforth vain, weak, cowardly, and unutterably wicked, he crawls through another page of history, and then—drops from the guillotine into the bottomless pit of eternal infamy. But at this moment he stood in his sky-blue waistcoat, carrying an immense bouquet of flowers and wheat, the central object of the eyes of Paris; and half insane with vanity and the sense of power, perhaps unconscious, or, for one brief moment, unmindful of the mutterings of hate around him. His arm was raised, that arm potent enough to crush the liberty of France, and, in the words of the terrible St. Just, "send the vessel of the revolution ploughing its way through a red sea of blood," and yet, afterward, too weak to let out his own poor life when, in the brutal sense of an awful fear, he would have escaped from the horrors before him into the arms of that haunting shadow that followed him to the end.

At the appointed moment Wisdom was unveiled and the statues fired, and once more in Paris reigned a Supreme Being, whose restorer and high-priest was Robespierre. "But, unfortunately," says the historian, "the smoke from the burning of the two images so blackened Wisdom that she looked more like a demon than a divine creature, and the whole appeared more like a burlesque on the Deity than a festival in his honour."

O, God of wisdom! in that smoke-grimed statue we see not Thee, but the Spirit of France, blackened by the smoke of Atheism, till all its divinity was hid, lost beyond redemption; and it stood like that statue, a reproach to the hand that raised it.

But now, in that wild ecstasy which marks every event of this insane period, the members of the Convention embrace and kiss each other, and the hoarse multitude roar and shout as they did at Notre Dame. Then in procession the assemblage wend their way to the Convention, where the leader of the section of Marat appeared at the bar and addressed them (in complimentary reference to the republican party called in the Convention the "Mountain"), beginning: "O Beneficent Mountain! O Protecting Sinai! accept our expressions of gratitude for all the sublime decrees which thou art daily issuing for the happiness of mankind." They do indeed recall Sinai, not the lawgiver or the law from its summit, but the

golden calf, the idol at its base, inaugurated in this a more sinful age by the bloody dance of death.

And here we leave them, bloody infidels congratulating their peers on the restoration of a Deity! And the tragedy goes on. It is a record for demons—for demons laugh—and surely never, in the world's history, were the absurd and ridiculous so inextricably mixed with horror and infamy.

We close the page. The lesson is over; the sermon is ended; that sermon preached by human events on the text of Divine inspiration—"The world by wisdom knew not God." The logic of facts is conclusive. The argument is unanswerable, and we turn from the contemplation of this reign of Reason with the most tender reverence for the boundless patience and immeasurable love of Him who, in passive strength and silent majesty, still "stretched out His hand when no man regarded."

If all the writings of French infidels in the eighteenth century were bound together, they must be harmless, if only the simple facts of this bloody, grotesque, and inconsistent "*age of reason*" were added as a second volume. In this the theory was tested, and there was obviously nothing extrinsic to prevent the most perfect realization of its utopia. Human wisdom sought and found an utter social, political, and religious vacuum, and filled it as it would. But instead of liberty, justice, virtue, equality, and peace, there ensued the worst tyranny the world ever saw: men saturated with sentiment preyed upon each other with the appetite of cannibals, and the smoke of the abomination rose to heaven in a dense cloud of human agony and sin, which dropped blood, *blood*, BLOOD, until the air grew thick with horror, and we turn shuddering away, to wonder if indeed there is any earthly limit to Divine love and patience.—*From the Christian Quarterly.*

THOUGHTS FOR THE THOUGHTFUL.

OUR conscience is bound down by the word of God; we can suffer all things, but we dare not overstep the word of God. The word of God must reign above all things, and remain the judge of all men.—LUTHER.

Deliver me from the narrowing influence of human lessons, from human systems of theology. Teach me directly out of the fulness and freeness of Thine own word. Hasten the time when, unfettered by sectarian intolerance, and unawed by the authority of men, the Bible shall make its rightful impression upon all; the simple and obedient readers thereof calling no man Master, but Christ only.—T. CHALMERS, D.D.

Beware of a nominal acquiescence in certain alleged truths; because you have been taught them in your infancy, or because they are the established opinions of those with whom you are connected.—DR. ABERCROMBIE.

The great day of account will alone show what frightful loss may then be suffered by Christian men who, whether in trade or in the ministry, have stifled their convictions, or *evaded the formation of any*, by turning away from the consideration of subjects which they *ought* to have investigated, simply lest inconvenient conclusions should be forced upon them. Alas! there are yet too many ways in which the birthright may be sold for a mess of pottage.—HENRY DUNN.

Can we imagine that the Church of God understands all truth as it is contained in the Holy Scriptures? and holds and teaches the whole of the truth, without admixture or addition?

May there not be some portions of both Old and New Testaments which have never yet been distinctly comprehended? Are there not some things

which, although held by the first churches, have long been lost, and are being only slowly and partially recovered? Is it not possible that there may be some grave errors which the Church has long maintained, and which it has yet to unlearn and renounce?

John Robinson, lamenting the obstinacy with which Lutherans and Calvinists refused to go beyond what their theological masters had taught, solemnly charged the 'Pilgrim Fathers' to be ready and willing to embrace any further light which God might reveal to them: for he was very 'confident the Lord had more light and truth yet to break forth out of His holy word.'

When we are at pains in searching after truth, that we may come to the knowledge of it, and may distinguish between it and error, then we buy it.—M. HENRY.

From the very beginning there were many heresies, errors, and false doctrines, prevalent among the professed followers of Christ; and such errors were maintained and propagated among those who formed what was called the Catholic Church. It is absurd to talk of the Church of any age as an infallible guide.—DEAN GOODE.

The humble man may search any truth boldly in the Scripture, without any danger of error. And if he be ignorant, he ought the more to read and search holy Scripture, to bring him out of ignorance.—FIRST HOMILY.

So strong an association is apt to be established in the mind between certain expressions and the *technical* sense to which they have been confined in some theological system, that when the student meets with them in Scripture, he at once understands them in that sense, in passages where perhaps an unbiased examination of the context would plainly show that such was not the author's meaning.—ARCHBISHOP WHATELY.

Truth is the most glorious thing; the least filing of this gold is precious. Truth is ancient; its grey hairs may make it venerable; it comes from Him who is the ANCIENT OF DAYS. Truth is unerring; it is the star that leads to Christ. Truth is pure; it is compared to silver refined seven times. (Ps. xii. 6.) 'There is not the least spot on truth's face; it breathes nothing but sanctity. Truth is triumphant: it is like a great conqueror, when all its enemies lie dead it keeps the field, and sets up its trophies of victory. Truth may be opposed, but never quite deposed. God is on truth's side, and so long there is no fear, but it will prevail. 'The heavens being on fire shall be dissolved;' but not that truth which came from heaven. (1 Peter, i. 25).—E. WATSON.

Would to God that all the party names and unscriptural phrases and forms which have divided the Christian world were forgotten, and that we all might agree to sit down together as humble, loving disciples, at the feet of our common Master, to hear His word, imbibe His spirit, and transcribe His life to our own.—JOHN WESLEY.

It becomes the All-wise God, and not mortal man, to be unchangeable. It doth not belong to such poor imperfect beings as we are, to remain for ever unmovable in all the same opinions that we have once indulged, or to stamp every sentiment with immortality. For a man to be obstinately tenacious of an old mistake, and incorrigibly fond of any obscure phrase or conception, because he has once admitted it, is the shame, and not the glory, of human nature.—DR. ISAAC WATTS.

The right disposition of mind is that which desires earnestly THE TRUTH, in whatever manner it may come to us.—JOHN FOSTER.

If God reveal anything to you by any other instrument of His, be as ready to receive it as ever you were to receive any truth by my ministry;

for I am verily persuaded—I am very confident—the *Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of His holy word.* For my part I cannot sufficiently bewail the condition of the Reformed Churches, who are come to a period in religion, and will go at present no further than the instruments of the first reformation. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; whatever part of His will our good God has imparted and revealed unto Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it. And the Calvinists, you see, stick fast where they were left by that great man of God. This is a misery much to be lamented.—ROBINSON'S *Last Charge to the Pilgrim Fathers.*

The Christian Church is even yet but very imperfectly freed from the unholy influence, and the mischievous operation, of human authority. The house requires to be more carefully swept than it was at the Reformation from Popery, and a more thorough search must be made for the old leaven, that it may be more completely cast out. Let all individual Christians, let all Christian Churches, learn to act on *principle*, that in reference to Christian faith, and duty, and worship, the question is not, *How thinkest thou?* but, *'How readeest thou?'* Not, What is the use and wont? but, What is written in the Law? Not, How is it to be arranged by us? but, How has it been settled by our Master? Let us seek out of the book of the LORD and read.—DR. BROWN.—*Biblical Notes and Queries.*

MINISTRY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST—NO. IX.

TEACHERS.

“First Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers.” 1 Cor. xii. 28.

THERE are yet to come under notice several important questions relating to the duties of the eldership, including those that embrace the exercise of discipline. We, however, consider that the ground will be more speedily got over by having the various ministries fairly in view before entering upon those questions, and, therefore, this paper will deal with teachers.

Apostles, prophets, overseers, and evangelists are necessarily teachers, but they are not the only teachers of the churches. A church may have efficient teachers when without brethren of the required experience and fitness for oversight. Having elders, it does not follow that they are the only teachers. It was never intended that teaching should appertain exclusively to their office. The Lord designs that no one talent shall be wrapped in a napkin because its possessor has not others—the great Head of the Church calls into exercise all the members of the body—“For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office; so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another. Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that *teacheth*, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation; he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.” Rom. xii. 5-8. Thus did an apostle intimate that *teaching, exhorting, ruling, ministering* (though sometimes exercised by the same person) are distinct, and may each be used to the glory of God by those who cannot engage in other service. It devolves upon the elders of the church, or upon the evangelist, to bring into use and to mature all the teaching power of the Church. Not that all may teach, for there are

many who cannot speak to edification, and the apostolic rule excludes all such. There is no more reason in expecting every member of a church to become a public teacher than there is in expecting every member of the human body to become a tongue. And while the "one man system" has shrivelled and enfeebled the tongue of the church the "all teacher system" is a still worse malady. A church with a swollen and inflamed tongue is a frightful spectacle. The apostle James writes, "Be ye not many teachers," (*didaskaloi*). James iii. 1. Take heed that ye teach not divers doctrines, for the doctrine of the apostles is one: and take heed also that you seek not to push yourselves into positions you are not able to fill.

But there are those who never can be teachers who might give a word of useful exhortation, whilst there are some who cannot even do that, and who should be required to keep silence in the churches. "Ye may all prophesy, one by one, that all may learn, that all may be comforted," referred to the prophets, and is limited to those who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, and, therefore, to edification. This proves that even when the edification of the church was provided for by direct inspiration, the Lord did not commit oversight, teaching, exhorting, ruling, ministering, &c., to one man—the pastor or minister—but to many, that all might learn, that all might be comforted: as though the apostle had said, no one man, not even an inspired one, is sufficient for the edification of an entire church—what will suit one will not be adapted to others, and, therefore, "Ye (who have the prophetic gift) may prophesy, one by one, that all may learn, that all may be comforted." 1 Cor. xiv. 31. The good order inculcated by the apostle lies equally distant from the popular "one man system," which dwarfs the mind of the church and completely buries capabilities, killing its one worker by over labour and its hundreds of others by want of opportunity to work, and at the same time leaves the bulk of the work undone; and from, on the other hand, that licentiousness, mis-called liberty—where everyone may do everything, whether to edification or not. In an instance or two we have heard men boasting of their liberty, and saying to their more sober neighbours, "Come and witness our order," and we have found in their order plenty of disorder. If the service is to commence with a hymn, it must be left for anyone to give it out who desires to do so—the reading of the Scripture must not be committed to those who are able to read with propriety, that would be taking away the liberty of the brotherhood—the preaching must also be open, and everyone permitted to chime in—and as to teaching, any attempt to restrict it to those who are able to edify would be denounced as downright popery. Such, in the opinion of some, is order. But in the opinion of all right-minded men it is confusion. "Liberty" it is called, but, if it be liberty, it is demented and in need of a strait jacket and a passport to a lunatic asylum. It is an insult to common sense.

Those may teach who can edify, and none others have the right. But who is to determine as to fitness, and by what standard is the teacher to be measured? The church is to determine. Elders, and evangelists before elders are ordained, have oversight in all that relates to the edification of the body. If then one think himself able to edify his brethren when he is not, those who by official position are responsible for its edification have to request such alteration in matter, manner, or language as the case may require. If he be unable or unwilling to comply with their request they should require his silence. If he deem their decision not in accordance with the mind of the church they should, at his request, submit to the church the question, "Is the teaching or exhortation of

this brother to your edification?" and the answer of the church is final. This meets the enquiry concerning the standard by which the individual is to be measured. There are brethren with "itching ears" whom few can edify—it may be questioned whether they can be built up in the most holy faith. This one does not reason with sufficient method, and the other fails to tell anything they do not already know—in fact the bulk of the teaching to them is horrible, and they wish that brethren A. and B. would do all the speaking. This class is not to be regarded—ere long you may expect them to make shipwreck of faith, or to be found "sitting under" some pulpit orator whose well-turned periods are music to the ear, though his words never reach the heart. There are also brethren far from destitute of faith and love who are apt to err upon this question. They are large-brained men, men of considerable culture, and not without spirituality. They judge of the speaker's power to edify by the benefit they derive from his discourse. But not one teacher in five hundred will reach their level, yet nine out of ten might be much edified by that which profits them but little. Ability, then, should be determined not alone by the power of the speaker, but in part by the condition of the hearers. Let the gospel be preached to miners in Cornwall, and a man who has toiled among them, well acquainted with divine truth and able to tell, in their own dialect, with love and power, what he knows and feels, will be to them a better preacher than one who comes with honours from Cambridge. Let a Church of such men be gathered. When they know the truth and the love of God is shed abroad in their hearts, in their own terms (many of them offensive to cultivated ears) they will edify one another. But place these men to speak to other assemblies, and edification will not result. The voice then of the church (or of the majority) saying "*we are edified*," is enough. The minority who are not able so to say must look for help from other speakers, and endeavour to find nutritious portions in the preparations of those who do not generally advantage them, remembering that good food, in some cases, does not build up the physical system owing to impaired digestion.

"Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak." 1 Cor. xiv. 34. Why not? The law of the Lord forbids it. But, "I don't see why it should." Perhaps not. Then, "I don't like it." Very likely. But the will of the Lord be done. But may not women teach? Certainly. The sisterhood are called to teach—as mothers they are teachers—as elder sisters they are called to instruct the younger—they are not forbidden to teach the brethren, and never forbidden to preach the gospel—Priscilla and Acquilla taught the eloquent Apollos the way of the Lord more perfectly, and many a brother has learned much from well-informed Christian women. The restriction applies only to the meetings of the church. There were women who did prophesy, but there they were not to use their gifts. To the prophets it was said, "Ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn," and so on, but it was immediately added, "Let your women keep silence in the churches," &c. In one important sense we are for all Christians, male and female, both teaching and preaching, and so assuredly were the apostles. And how sadly is this preaching and teaching neglected? Christian men and Christian women then, awake to your true position as preachers of Christ and teachers of the things of His kingdom! As Nathan spake unto David speak ye. In the house, shop, market, speak for Christ. "Teach from house to house." Let every brother be a home missionary, and every sister a "Bible woman."

D. K.

BAPTIZO IN THE HELLENISTIC OR NEW TESTAMENT DIALECT, No. II.

WE next refer to the use of *baptizo* by Josephus. The authority of this writer is of the highest value to us in determining the meaning of this word in Hellenistic or New Testament Greek.—First, Josephus was a Jew; he was born and educated in Palestine, and in the Jewish religion, and lived at Jerusalem to mature years. He was born only about thirty-seven years after Christ. He wrote in the time the New Testament was written, and wrote in the same diction—Hellenistic Greek—and in its best form among the Jews; he wrote as a cultivated scholar. His testimony in the question before us is decisive. How does he use the word *baptizo*? We will cite the several cases of its occurrence in his works.

Jewish Wars, B. 2, ch. 18, 4,—in describing the death of Simon, he says, "Stretching out the right hand, so as to be unseen by none, he plunged (baptized) the whole sword in his own neck." What does this mean? *Sprinkle, pour*,—or plunged, buried? A child can understand it.

Jewish Antiquities, B. 15, ch. 3: 3, he describes the drowning in a swimming-bath or pool, of the boy Aristobulus, by the command of Herod. He says, "Continually pressing down and immersing (baptizing) him while swimming, as if in sport, they did not desist till they had completely drowned him."

He relates the same occurrence, *Jewish wars*, B. 1, ch. 22: 2, as follows: "And there, according to command, being immersed (baptized) by the Gauls in a swimming-bath (or pool) he dies." Can *baptizo* here, by any imaginable possibility, mean sprinkle or pour? And this is Hellenistic Greek, written by a Jew in the days of the apostles!

Again, *Jewish Wars*, B. 3, ch. 8: 5, he says, "As I also account a pilot most cowardly, who, through dread of a storm, before the blast came, voluntarily submerged (baptized) the vessel."

Jewish Wars, B. 3, ch. 9: 3—describing the vessels in the port of Joppa, he says, "And many (of the vessels), struggling against the opposing swell toward the sea,—for they feared the shore, being rocky, and the enemies upon it,—the billow rising high above, submerged (baptized)."

In speaking of the prophet Jonah's flight by sea, he says,—*Antiquities of the Jews*, B. 9, ch. 10: 2,—"The ship being just about to be submerged (baptized)."

In his Life of himself, Sect. 3, he describes a shipwreck: "For our vessel having been submerged (baptized) in the midst of the Adriatic,—being about six hundred in number, we swam through the whole night." And again, he describes the fight with the Roman soldiers on the Lake of Galilee: "And when they returned to come near, they suffered harm before they could inflict any, and were submerged (baptized) along with their vessels; and those of the submerged (baptized) who raised their heads, either a missile reached, or a vessel overtook." In like manner, figuratively, he says, *Jewish Wars*, B. 2, ch. 20: 1, "And after the calamity of Cestius, many of the distinguished Jews swam away from the city, as from a submerged (baptized) ship."

Here we have repeatedly *baptize* used to express the sinking of a ship under the water. Is it at all possible for any man to mistake the meaning of the word in this repeated use? Can it, by even the most ingenious device, be made here to signify pouring or sprinkling,—these meanings that are sought to be sustained by Hellenistic Greek? Here is Hellenistic Greek! and here *baptizo* means *submersion under the water*, and by no pos-

sibility anything else! Can anybody deny this? And if this is, as thus shown, the Hellenistic usage of this word, by authors writing at the same time, in the same dialect of the apostles, and by native Jews also, the point as to its New Testament meaning is settled.

There are several other instances of the use of baptizo in Josephus. Describing the purifying of the people during their mourning for Miriam, sister of Moses, he says: "Those there, who were defiled by the dead body, casting a little of the ashes into a fountain, and dipping (baptizing) a hyssop branch, they sprinkled, on the third and seventh of the days [the thirty days]." Here is the word for *sprinkling* used alongside of baptizo, but not synonymous with it; it denotes a very different action. The two words here cannot possibly denote the same act; this every one can see. It is the same series of actions as described for such purposes in Lev. xiv. 15, 16: "And the priest shall take some of the log of oil and *pour it* (*epicheei*) into the palm of his own left hand. And the priest shall *dip* (*bapsei*—from *bapto*) his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall *sprinkle* (*ranei*—from *raino*) of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord." The same *three actions*,—quite distinct,—in each case, all given in both cases, no two of them synonymous or to be confounded together. A child can understand this. In the old Latin version of Josephus this passage is thus given as to the word baptizo: "*—in aquam immergentes,*" &c.—*immersing into water.*"

There are several instances of the figurative use of the word—in the sense of *overwhelm*. *Jewish Wars*, B. 1, ch. 27: 1, he refers to the mock trial of Herod's sons: "This, as a final blast, *overwhelmed* (baptized) the tempest-tossed youths;" using the figure of a ship sunk by a storm.

Same work, B. 3, ch. 7: 15, the same figure is used. The people expostulate with Josephus when he purposes to leave Jerusalem. They say, "that it did not become him either to fly from the enemy or to abandon friends; or to leap off, as from a ship overtaken by a storm, into which he had entered in fair weather, that he would himself *overwhelm* (baptize) the city," &c.

Same work—He says of the robbers that got into the city,—“Who, even apart from the sedition, afterwards *whelmed* (baptized) the city.” This is a strong figure, clearly understood, of *plunging* a city into calamities. So David says, Ps. lxi. 2, “I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me; . . . vs. 15,—let not the waterflood overflow me.” So Job xiii. 11,—“The floods of water cover thee.” In all languages the word for *immerse*, is used in this figurative sense. Classic and Hellenistic writers, pagan and Christian, often so use it. Plato, in his *Euthydemus* c. 7,—speaking of young Cleinias, confounded with the subtleties of the Sophists, says, “And I, perceiving that the youth was *overwhelmed* (baptized), wishing to give him a respite,” &c. Shleiermacher translates baptize here by *ganz zugedeckt*—“quite covered up.”

Antiquities of the Jews, B. 10, ch. 9: 4, describing the murder of Gedaliah by his own guests, after he became intoxicated, Josephus says, “Seeing him in this condition, and *plunged* (baptized) by drunkenness into stupor and sleep, Ishmael, leaping up, with his ten friends, slays Gedaliah and those reclining with him at the banquet.” So also in classic usage. Plato, *Symposium*, ch. 4, complaining of the bad effects of an immoderate use of wine, says, “For I myself am of those who where yesterday *overwhelmed* (baptized).” We surely do not speak of men being sprinkled or poured into, or with intoxication and sleep; we say, as the Greeks said, that men are plunged into or overwhelmed with, intoxication and sleep. Such are

the uses of baptizo by this Jewish Hellenistic writer of the days of the Apostles. Not a single passage here where the word is not clear and distinct in its *one*, perpetual meaning of *immerse, plunge*. No ingenuity can obscure these passages to the candid, though the simplest, mind. And this is Hellenistic Greek, immediately in all respects as to time, author, country, alongside of the New Testament Greek. The force of this testimony is as complete as evidence possibly can be; men could not construct, for the special purpose, anything stronger. We have shown also that Hellenistic usage here does not differ from Classic usage.

Philo of Alexandria was also a Jew, and a man of great learning, strongly imbued with Greek philosophy. He was a very prolific writer on religious and philosophical subjects, and wrote in the Greek language, using the then 'common' or 'Hellenistic' dialect. He lived in the middle of the first century after Christ, and therefore is in every respect, a full representative of the Greek language in the days of the New Testament authors. His use of the word baptizo is very definite and clear. In one passage, preserved by Eusebius, he says, "And one might show it also from this, that those who live soberly and content with little, excel in understanding; but those on the contrary, who are always glutted with drink and food, are least intelligent, as though the reason were *whelmed by the things* (baptized) *overlying it*." This is certainly clear; it is needless to develop the meaning of the word here,—“the reason is baptized by the things overlying it.” So again in his *Contemplation of Life* (Mangey, vol. ii. p. 478),—"And I know some, who when they become slightly intoxicated, before they are completely *over-whelmed* (baptized)" &c., &c. The same use as above in Josephus. Of course to be *completely baptized* (teleos baptisthenai) in wine and intoxication, is neither to be completely sprinkled or poured,—words without sense in such a place, but to be completely *plunged* or *drenched*, as expressed by words with this meaning in all languages. It would certainly be a hard task for the pedobaptists, who seek for sprinkling and pouring in baptizo in Hellenistic Greek, to get such meaning out of the passages we have here quoted, (and we have quoted, we believe, all in which the word occurs) from these two Jewish Hellenistic writers of the New Testament period; it would certainly be curious to see them attempt the task!

EARLY GREEK VERSIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Early in the history of the Christian church, Greek translations were made of the Old Testament. These were made, of course, in the Greek of that day, the Hellenistic diction, especially as spoken and written by Jews and Christians, and represents in fullest form the dialect under examination.

The Version of Aquila, a Jew,—once a christian, was made in the first half of the second century after Christ. His translations of the Old Testament was made for the use of his Jewish brethren in their controversies with the Christians. For this reason it was a *strictly literal one*, aiming at the closest possible exact representation of the original Hebrew in the Greek.* Job ix. 31, our common English translation renders, "Yet thou shalt *plunge* me in the ditch, and my own clothes shall abhor me"—that is, "make me to be ashamed"—from their being covered with filth. The Hebrew word for *plunge* here is *taval*, the same as in the case of *Naaman*, 2 Ks. v. 11, where it is translated *dip*,—a word that never means anything else but *dip* or *immerse*, as given in our article of last

* See Herzog's Encyclopædic,—Article, *Bibleübersetzungen*,—"Bible translations."

month,—which see. This passage Aquila translates thus, “Even then thou wilt baptize me in corruption”; in Hebrew *taval*, in the common English *plunge*, in Aquila *baptizo*.—This shows the meaning of baptizo in the days of Aquila,—that is, in the Hellenistic Greek of the apostolic age.

The Version of Symmachus was made about the last half of the second century after Christ. Symmachus was a learned Samaritan, but went over to the Jews, and for their benefit made a new translation of the Old Testament into Greek. This version was of a high merit, and also, of course, represents fully the Hellenistic or common dialect,—and more particularly as spoken and written by the Palestine Jews,—the Greek as we find it in the New Testament. If a change in *baptizo* took place from the ancient classic Greek, in the Hellenistic dialect of the days of Christ and the apostles, certainly the change would have been no less in the days of Symmachus. In his translation he gives Ps. lxix. 2, “I am baptized into bottomless depths,” *ebaptithen eis aperantous kataduseis*; in our common version this reads, “I sink in deep mire.”

These quotations from the Greek versions of the Old Testament, made after Christ, show distinctly what the meaning of *baptizo* was in the Hellenistic diction,—that is meant simply to plunge and immerse,—and not to sprinkle or pour. These two latter meanings are utterly irreconcilable with the occurrences of this word in the places cited.

We shall next refer to the Christian Greek writers,—called the Greek Fathers.

C. L. L.

THE CITY OF GOD.

THE midnight storm is loud as it sweeps among mountain pines,
The sea, which cannot rest, with strange phosphorescence shines;
Out from the hoary deep the terrible phantoms arise,
Each one bent upon quenching some lamp of the vaulted skies.
But above the tempest high—its clamour and shapes of dread,
The summer hills of God are in ancient beauty spread.
Suns of eternity burn in splendour which cannot pale,
And central peace is reigning behind the awful veil.
Man builds for time and death on ground shaking under his feet;
When revolution and war with natural thunders meet,
Castle and temple go down into sudden and fiery grave,
And cities of ancient fame are swept by insurgent wave.
But there is a city of God, built by the hand divine.
Descending to the earth whose towers of silver shine,
The house of natural man was founded upon the floods,
Strengthened with rocky ramparts, and flecked with solemn woods;
Its stately rivers ran strong—rejoicing on to the sea,
Its fields of living green waved in abundance free;
But man the glorified, with crowned immortals enrolled,
Has a city with jasper walls and streets of purest gold.
Of old the morning stars did burn and sing and rejoice,
And all the sons of God shouted with mighty voice!
When the earth took cosmical shape, and was hung by golden chains,
From the royal orb of flame which gloriously reigns.
But that was the world of conflict, and this is the home of life!
All foul dark forms are gone with all the tempest and strife.
As the temple of Hebrew fame arose like a vision fair,

And the sound of a hammer never fell on the air,
So the greater glory—the city of life was piled
From the thought of God so noiseless, supreme and undefiled.
The sons of light are gathered in the auspicious hour;
The nobles of the Lord—crowned with transcendent power;
Forms of celestial mould and more than regal grace,
The light of love in the bloom of each majestic face.
Through fields of death and hell they smote triumphal way,
To shores of higher life and the clime of unfading day.
Their purple is the purest, their royalties are known;
They see the face of God upon His argent throne!
Uplift the voice of song, let the star banners burn with fire.
Let all the trumpets blow and the harpers sweep the lyre!
Let life be deep and rich—the floods of eternity roll
Wave upon wave in glory as soul mingles with soul.
Such fields were never seen in the days of death and time,
Not primal paradise could furnish such a clime;
Beyond all thoughts of beauty, far beyond the richest dream,
The emerald of the grass and the crystal of the stream;
From olden dark sea caves and crypts of the virgin earth,
The gems of ray serene are brought to the light of birth.
The lustre of the amaranth, the incense of the grove,
Proclaim the vital union of life with perfect love.
Beyond all earthly compare those fruits of purple and rose,
Where the tree of Eden spreads and the river of life overflows;
Pain and sorrow are gone with darkness and evil dreams,
No place for storm or plague, or day with broken gleams;
No lamp is hung on high, no luminaries shine,
The fountain-head of light is there with glory all divine!
Night-anguish and woe and death himself are gone past,
All fled away on the wings of a purifying blast.
No rites of conscious sin—no solemn temple glooms,
For all the ground is holy in paradisaical blooms!
God, the father of light, spreads his wings over all,
And His sunshine steeps the throng in the land where no shadows fall.
Oh, that river of life! rushing out from the throne,
The music of those glad voices where no disease is known!
The shout sublime of that host who from battles fought and won,
Are fairer than the morning star and brighter than the sun.

G. GREENWELL.

Reviews, Notes, Passing Events, &c.

LETTER FROM SISTER CAMPBELL.

I SEND you for publication the following interesting letter from Sister Campbell—a mother in Israel, an humble, earnest, Christian woman, and the widow of Alex. Campbell. She addressed the letter to her relative, Enos Campbell, in remon-

strance against the advocacy by him of the use of instrumental music in the worship. She sends me a copy of the letter, authorizing me to publish it, in whole or in part, if, in my judgment, the publication would result in any good. She does not

attempt to thoroughly argue the matter. The letter contains interesting allusions to the worship in the Bethany mansion, and the Bethany church, and expresses the deep grief of a good woman's heart over the prospective trouble that is, possibly, in store for us in connection with this innovation. We all highly esteem and love Sister Campbell, and it is to be hoped that this earnest, solemn, affectionate protest will not be without influence in removing from our worship a practice that is wholly without sanction, and that is only productive of evil, and that is continually.

H.

BETHANY HOUSE, March 28, 1870.

Elder Enos Campbell.

VERY DEAR BROTHER—I have been thinking much about you, and therefore I want to express myself seriously and solemnly to you on what I consider an important, solemn topic—that of aiding and abetting instrumental music being introduced into the worshipping assemblies of the house of God, “which is the pillar and support of the truth.” I want to speak plainly and honestly to you on this soul-absorbing topic, which is now agitating the churches everywhere, and wounding and piercing to the inmost heart many of our best and most devoted brethren and sisters. I shall not attempt to argue the case with you, but only make some few statements of facts as they shall occur to me.

In the first place, permit me to tell you that I have just finished reading the very able and Christian-like response of Bro. H. (as contained in the March number of the *Harbinger*), to Bro. E.'s article, published in the January number of 1870. I have also read with care again and again that prettily-written dissertation on music by E. in the January number alluded to. I cannot do justice to my own feelings nor to you by the pen, for I more amply elaborate my views (and I

believe more effectually) in conversation. But first let me state, that I take it for granted that you are the person who writes over the signature of E. in the *Millennial Harbinger*. I know of olden time your fondness for music, and am more impressed from the sentiment and style of the article alluded to that you are the author. At any rate, be that as it may, allow me of your clemency to pen a few scattered thoughts on the subject before us.

You, Bro. Enos Campbell, know full well that I love music, both vocal and instrumental. You know full well, too, that as sure as the morning and evening sacrifice was attended to, that the songs of Zion resounded in this old mansion. But never was instrumental music tolerated or called in to aid the worship in the family. No, the revered patriarch advocated the “melody of the heart” in unison with the “human voice divine” in the worship of the family and in the church; and if he were upon earth now he would do the same. He wrote about it and spoke about it. That you are well aware of, and he never yielded to the teachings of men in regard to the matter. He never approved nor recognized “expediency” as a doctrine to introduce it into the worship of the living God—in the Christian Church. I say again, you are well aware that he did not. He was not opposed to music; for, as I have heard him say, he had studied it as a science when young, and understood “time well,” but that he was born tuneless. Yet no one enjoyed more than he did, both in the family and in the house of worship, the songs of Zion, and the praises of the Lord of Hosts; and he always united in making a “joyful noise” as he used to say. But never did he enjoy the berevering, reverberating sound of the organ or melodeon in the house of worship. I have been in various cities with him where they had organs in the houses kindly

offered by sectarian friends for him to preach in. I was confident while they introduced the worship with the sound of the organ, that though Mr. Campbell complaisantly yielded to it, he at the same time cordially disapproved of it. It was an annoyance to him, and nothing but his Christian forbearance led him to endure it, even for a short season. They might as well introduce other Jewish ceremonies to conflict with the Christian worship—that of the sackbut and harp. As for myself, I can truly say that I have tried to sing (years past) in unison with the instrument in the house of worship, but could never enjoy myself in the “spirit-making melody in my heart.” I know the young and the gay can fire each other's souls in singing different parts and duets on the piano, but badly would that comport with the solemnity of the worship of God. And as for the leading worldly choir of the gallery, I looked upon it as profanation, and always languished under it with sorrow of heart!

But you will say, what of all this that you have said? There are no arguments in all of your already lengthy remarks. Well, perhaps not. But let what has been said have its weight, if it have any! But now I refer you to yourself, my brother, and desire you to give me one command or example in the New Testament, for using instrumental music. Did the apostles or the primitive Christians use them? And where they commanded to use them by the Divine Teacher? I feel assured that you can not lay your finger upon *one* such command. But to sing praises and make “melody in the heart” you can. You will not certainly adopt the manner of the many in argument and say, as they say in regard to baptism, “We are at liberty to have different forms.” Or, perhaps, you will say in this case as a dear brother (now no more), said not long since in his preaching: “This is a

progressive age, and we must adopt music (that is, instrumental) in our churches.” Who ever heard of the precepts and teachings of the blessed Saviour being progressive in their nature? We, as Christians, may be progressive in our faith, in holiness, and in all Christian graces and virtues, but the Saviour's teachings are a unit—they are divine, and mean the same thing in all ages, and need no progressive influence. I fear, I tremble, for innovations in the Church of Christ. Let the truthfulness and simplicity of the gospel prevail, no matter what fanciful or imaginative men may think or say. We, as a body of Christians, understanding the New Testament (just as though it had fallen from heaven) as we do, cannot admit anything into the worship that has not “a thus saith the Lord.” We cannot be so *pliant* or complaisant as Henry Ward Beecher, who said, “That if any one wished it he would baptize them every week or month.” No, my dear Bro. E., this should not be—this cannot be the case with us—who have the precious volume of God our Father in our hands, and the full effulgence of the sun of righteousness beaming upon us.

I say that I tremble for the church when innovations are being made. We should, as humble followers of Christ, say as the great apostle once said,—“That if meat caused his brother to stumble, or be grieved, or offended, that he would not eat meat so long as he lived. But how many of our brethren, though without precept or example, glory in triumphing over a weak brother or a sister, as they esteem them, by urging the use of the organ or the melodeon in the house where the weak and the strong, the poor and the rich, assemble together to worship the meek and lowly and loving Jesus.

You that are determined to have your own way by introducing into the church what you must admit is of doubtful disputation, and what

has been done so long without. Think soberly and seriously upon this matter, and see whether it will add to the good of the brotherhood or to the glory of God. And here let me ask the favour of those who are abetting instrumental music, to please read Mr. Campbell's article on that subject, as they will find it in the Harbinger for the year 1851, page 581.

I say again that I fear innovations, and trust that the good old brethren that are yet left standing on the wall of Zion, will be faithful before they go hence, in lifting up their warning voices against everything and anything that looks like a departure from the simplicity and holiness of the blessed gospel. This fashionable day and generation are putting very assiduously and insidiously many claims to a sinful conformity to the customs and fashions of the time, that will not yield good fruit either to their own souls, or to the glory of God. Some, I fear, are loving to be called "Rabbi" and styled "Reverend," at the same time knowing there is no authority for it; for in the Scripture there are no Reverends. How would it look for, us speaking of Peter and Paul, to call them the Rev. Mr. Paul and the Rev. Mr. Peter? Would it not look supremely ridiculous? And yet I have heard that even some of our brethren have desired to be addressed as the *Rev. Mr.* so and so, and that, too, though they had it not in years, nor in their superior wisdom. But according to the Scriptures, how beautifully apposite it is, when speaking of the Most High, to say, "Holy and Reverend is thy name." The good John Newton (an Episcopalian,) when the degree of Doctorship was conferred upon him, returned it by saying, "that if he wished to take degrees of Doctorship that he must go back to Africa where he had been the slave of slaves." But here let me add another thought whilst speaking of the brethren. Whilst I do believe

that they "love one another with pure hearts, fervently," making all due allowance for the infirmity of our nature, and still keeping in mind the beautiful saying of the Psalmist, "Behold, how good and pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity;" and again, to remember the apostle's exhortation (and how needful to be practiced amongst the brotherhood), "Be pitiful; be courteous." What an influence it would have upon themselves and upon society at large, if brethren, when speaking of uniting, and especially the editorial corps, would they but remember and practice this soothing and beautifying spirit, which you know was so perfectly exemplified in all that our Divine Master said and did whilst he sojourned upon earth.

O, my good brother, seeing that your "work of faith and labour of love" in the good cause has been so long eminently blessed, may I not hope that you will still go on to perfection by "endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace." Labour to keep peace and good-will in the Church, and strive to keep out this untaught and unprofitable question in regard to the Jewish organ, &c., being introduced into the Christian worship. Let our worship be the incense of the heart, rising spontaneously with our morning and evening expressions of gratitude, supplications, thanksgivings, deprecations, and prayers.

Now, may the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make us perfect in every good work to do His will, working in us that which is well-pleasing in His sight through Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen.

I remain, your sister in the good hope of eternal life, S. H. CAMPBELL.

Apostolic Times.

LIFE OF ELDER JOHN SMITH.

"His interest in the religious affairs of the neighbourhood continued to increase. His zeal gave warmth to the family prayers, and to the social worship. The cabins of his brethren were filled by turns, as the frequent appointment for meeting went round the neighbourhood. He was often urged to exhort his brethren, and he felt a strange desire to give utterance to feelings which these occasions always excited within him. But still he waited for a call—for some bush to burn, or other sign to appear that would assure him of the Lord's consent. His brethren urged that, when God gives a man a talent he gives the right to use it also; and that if he could not preach, yet he might without presumption, at least speak a word of exhortation. He was finally persuaded to lay aside his scruples, and one evening, at the social prayer meeting, he consented to say a few words to the people. His heart on that occasion was full, for the song and the prayer had stirred his spirit, and the inspiration of the hour was on him. The room was crowded; the blaze from the hearth shone full upon his face, as he arose, and stood with bashful emotion near the little table. He gazed on the faces around him; and a strange, bewildering torrent of feeling rushed to his heart. His mind was suddenly darkened; the thoughts which he had meditated for the occasion left him. He tried to recall them; but he could not, his lip quivered, and he was speechless. Turning from the stand, he rushed from the house into the darkness without. He fled across the yard like one affrighted, intending to quit a place where the Lord had thus rebuked him. But as he ran, his foot struck against something and he fell, and, for a moment, he lay stunned on the ground. As he arose, the cloud seemed to be

lifted from his mind; his thoughts came back to him clear and distinct; and he felt he had the power of utterance once more. He returned to the house, where his brethren still sat. Standing in their midst again, he spoke with such fluency and fervor of soul, that his exhortation seemed indeed to be with the power of the Holy Spirit.

He continued to exhort at these meetings, whenever pressed to do so; but his mind was disturbed more or less, all the while by the want of a call. He hoped on, however; and as he was too unimaginative to see a ghostly vision, he watched for some simple sign, which he might with reason interpret as the voice of God.

It was not long before a *vision* came—an unspiritual one, indeed, but none the less beautiful on that account, and none the less powerful in its influence upon his life. At one of those meetings for prayer, as he thoughtfully sat and looked on the group around him, his eyes rested on the features of a young woman, by the name of Anna Townsend. She had occasionally come with her parents to meetings; and had listened with some interest to the exhortations of the young stranger; but not until that moment had she ever been the object of his special regard. Now, her thoughtful and serene face, rich with the pleasing bloom of healthful and womanly beauty, strangely impressed the heart of the young man and Christian; and his destiny was shaped by the vision of that hour.

John Smith was not without susceptibility; and he was by no means wanting in a tender regard for the other sex. His respect for all virtuous women, was, in fact, unbounded. He was averse to gallantry, free from every tinge of romance, and wholly unskilled in the arts of courtship. He had a

notion that no young man should mingle much with young women, till he had first made up his mind to marry; and that he should then proceed in a business-like way to seek one that was suitable and willing to become his wife. He had conscientiously governed himself by this rule; for although he was now in the twenty-second year of his age, he had never spoken to more than one or two young women in his life.

The impression which Anna Townsend made on his heart that evening was serious and abiding. He was now a man in years, and the owner of two hundred acres of land; he had left the parental roof forever, and he felt that he could push his own fortunes in the world. He resolved, therefore, to take a wife. After a few days' deliberation he made his first visit to the cabin of old Mr. Townsend, and on the 9th of December, 1806, he wedded the first and only maiden that he had ever loved.

On the next morning he proposed to his wife, as his clearing was some four miles off, and he would lose too much time in going so far to his work every day, that they should move over at once to their house in the '*Hollow*,' and live to themselves. The proposal accorded with her own wishes; for, in the mind of a young wife, the idea of domestic independence is inseparable from that of home. The preparations to move were soon made. A deep and heavy snow had fallen during the night, and the shrubs and vines were weighed down and tangled across the narrow paths, until the forest was almost impassable. An ox-sledge, drawn by a sturdy yoke, was made ready. A bed, a few cooking utensils, and some provisions—the gift of the mother, and the bride's only dowry—were placed upon it. The bride herself sat bravely on the sledge in the midst of her household stuff, while the groom, with his axe on his shoulder, stepped proudly on

ahead to guide the floundering team, and to cut open a road to his cabin.

Their cabin, which they at last reached, was but an undaubed pen of logs. Through many a crevice the snow had drifted in, and it lay in piles on the earthy floor. The little square window was unshuttered and unglazed, and the entrance was closed against them by the bending shrubs. He cleared away the straggling branches, and his wife went in and took possession of her cheerless home. Gaping walls, a floor of dirt, and a stoneless hearth heaped with sooty snow, were all that met her eyes as she looked for the first time on her own fireside. But in a little while, Smith provided abundant fuel; his flint yielded the ready spark, and a heap of logs and rich faggots soon blazed like a conflagration in the fire place. But an empty cabin, without a puncheon or a hearth-stone, and open on all sides to December storms, was certainly no luxurious chamber for a bride, no very pleasant home for a young and hopeful wife. But she knew nothing of luxury, and therefore felt none of the wants which it creates. They were, poor, indeed; but their poverty was unfelt; for none of their neighbours were rich; and all alike, were accustomed to privation and toil.

The roaring fire soon thawed the hovel, and the dirty wall and the unsightly floor were swept again and again. Smith, having cut a few stout logs, of the proper length and thickness, brought them in upon his shoulders, and laid them down for sleepers in a corner of the room. Across these he placed some clapboards, found piled in the woods close by. On this rude platform, the bed was laid, while a spare coverlet or two, was hung against the wall, to turn the cold wind, which rushed in through every crevice. When the evening came on, the fire was replenished; a great log was rolled before the hearth, and the contented pair sat down together upon it in

the light of the cheerful blaze, and talked over the toils of the coming day.

His task for the winter was to clear a few acres of land and have a field in readiness for planting in the early spring. During the day he laboured alone in the clearing—girdling the larger trees, and cutting out the undergrowth of shrubs, whose pole-like trunks he trimmed and piled away for fencing. At night, he worked in his fire-lighted cabin, cheered and assisted by his wife. The walls were soon well chinked and daubed; a shutter was made for the window, and the awkward door was shaped and fitted till it shut out the wintry storms. His axe and wedge prepared the puncheons in the forest which he laid down at night on the oaken-sleepers and then smoothed with his axe. A few evenings thus spent, and he stepped on as firm a floor as a cabin ever had; no happier feet ever pressed a carpet in the mansions of the rich.

He next cut from the forest the trunk of a young dogwood tree, which forked at the proper height from the ground; and having trimmed it, he set it up in his cabin for the outer corner post of his bedstead. One end was let into the floor with the augur; the other was fastened securely to the joist above. Two hickory poles, which served for rails, rested at right angles to each other in the fork of this post, and in the crevice of the log on each side of the corner. Across this frame, peeled hickory rods were laid in close parallels for slats; strips of clean linden bark, easily torn from the tree at almost any season of the year, were next laid down; the bed, with all its wealth of covering, was then spread, and the arrangements for repose were complete.

The labour of inclosing and cultivating a farm in the wilderness without help, was severe; but he found time to keep alive not only his own religious zeal, but that of his neigh-

bors also. He had by his fervent piety and his force of character, come to be the religious head of a scattered brotherhood. He had persuaded them to keep up their society meetings, at which he was always present, to confirm or to comfort them by words of exhortation; and he now began to urge them to come together, and to constitute themselves regularly into a Church.

His wife, who was unconverted at the time of her marriage, soon became deeply concerned on the subject of religion. He was, of course, much interested in the progress of her experience; but he reverently and hopefully left her alone with her God. The young husband, who, in any other trouble would have succoured her, even at the sacrifice of his life abandoned her in this the most solemn and perplexing of her trials; for no obtrusive human agency, thought he, must interfere with the work of the Spirit. She asked him one day, what was the meaning of a certain text: and he was too considerate to give her any explanation at the time, fearing that in the simplicity of her unregenerate heart, she might improperly take comfort from it, and rely more on the Word than on the Holy Ghost. Her joyous deliverance, at last, relieved his own heart and fired anew his zeal for God.

His brethren, scattered through the wild country in which he lived, came together at his call, and were regularly constituted into a Church of seventeen members by Isaac Denton, who, by special request, had come from Stockton's Valley to officiate on the occasion. A log meeting-house was soon built, though several miles distant from his cabin; and a preacher, Richard Barrier, was persuaded to take the young Church for a while under his ministerial charge.

It was usual among the Baptist preachers of that day, and is yet the custom in some parts of the county,

to unite four congregations under one pastorate. Although each congregation was visited but once a month, such members as lived at a convenient distance and were zealously enough disposed, often followed the preacher around his pastoral cycle, and thus enjoyed his ministrations every Sabbath.

It should be remembered, too, that the preachers of that day were a class of hardy, pioneer farmers, who had not forgotten the church tax which they and their fathers used to pay in Virginia to support the ministry of an established religion. They seemed to have made it a point of Christian honor, after the war was over, to preach the gospel without charge, and to support themselves independently, by hard labor, through the week. But little, if anything, was paid to them as a salary; some were even zealous enough to neglect their own families for the sake of the Church, and to let their own corn fields grow up in weeds, that they might work the more constantly in the vineyard of the Lord. The people had learned so thoroughly the lesson of muzzling the ox, that they could see their faithful pastors in want without making much effort to relieve them. In fact, they had been educated by the preachers themselves, into the notion that it was sinful to pay men for preaching the Gospel.

Within the bounds of Stockton's Valley Association, a community dismissed from the old Green River Association in 1804, there lived and labored for many years a gentle-hearted and godly old preacher by the name of Barnes. He was very poor in spirit and in purse, homely in countenance and person, and exceedingly humble in demeanor before God and man. He lived in a rude cabin among rocky hills, with but little worldly care beyond the maintenance of a small family, and of a faithful horse that carried him round the circuit of his four congregations

every month in the year.

One summer a very severe drouth came upon the land, so that little corn was raised, and every green thing was withered and parched. Poor Barnes felt keenly the pinch of famine, as bread and meat began to fail him, and as the dry, dead leaves on the hillside no longer furnished provender for old Gray. Still, master and beast made their accustomed rounds, though with less and less spirit, as the dreary year wore on. At last, at one of his monthly meetings, after the sermon of the day was over, and the Church was over, and the Church was seated in a business session, a kind and thoughtful man by the name of McKenzie, who had noticed the leanness of the preacher's horse, arose, and proposed that if any of the brethren could conveniently spare a little meal or corn, they should send it to Brother Barnes family without delay. He enforced his appeal by remarking that, Brother Barnes had been preaching for them faithfully lo, these many years, and yet the Church had never been called on to contribute anything for his support.

The old preacher sat near by with his head bowed to his lap, and his face covered with his hands, which were brawny and brown with toil. The suggestion was at once opposed by a brother who was zealous for the law and the usages of the Church. He argued that the Lord did not tax his children to support the Gospel; that he had ordained that it should be dispensed without money and without price; that the gifts by way of compensation to those who preached it, were apt to puff them up with pride, and that, though Bro. Barnes rode some distance to speak to the people, many of them came quite as far to hear him.

McKenzie rejoined that, in his opinion, the law of Christ was explicit, clearly commanding that they who preach the Gospel should

live of the Gospel; and he urged the proposed contribution on legal as well as charitable grounds.

But his opponent replied with emphasis, that he was surprised to hear the Scripture in question quoted in referring to such things as meat and bread; that it was to be understood only in a spiritual sense. 'To live of the Gospel,' said he, 'is to live on the sweet and heavenly feelings which the Gospel produces. On these divine things, the preacher ought to feed.'

Old Brother Barnes suddenly raised his head, and asked:

'And what is old Gray to do, my brethren? he can't live on them feelin's.'

The preacher in charge of the new Church was not long in discovering

John Smiths' qualifications for the ministry; and he at once proposed to the congregation that liberty should be given him to improve his gifts wherever Providence should open a door. As a Licentiate, Smith was more than ever troubled about his call, especially in view of the fact that he would soon be urged by his brethren to submit to ordination. He now watched every phase of ordinary providence without, and every change of feeling within, in hope that in some incident or experience, he might find the encouragement he sought. For he had persuaded himself that this encouragement would be given, if given at all, by means of some simple token, and in some natural way."

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.

THE Annual Meeting was held in Newcastle-on-Tyne, August 9, 10, 11. The Meetings were held in the Chapel, Gloucester Street, commencing on Tuesday evening, at Six o'clock, at which time the number of representatives and other brethren present was much larger than had been expected, and that number was afterwards considerably increased. After singing, prayer, and words of welcome by J. Moffit, David King was unanimously chosen as Chairman of the business meetings, and E. Fraser, of Birmingham, and R. Hay, of Wigan, were appointed Secretaries. The statistical information from the churches was then given and numerous letters were heard, after which the report and financial statement of the evangelist committee were read.

ITEMS FROM THE REPORT.

The attention of our last Annual Gathering was closely directed to the desirability of considerably increasing our resources and, in accordance with the recommendation then made, your Committee urged upon the officers of churches, and the brethren generally, the duty of adopting some well-devised plan for securing a larger amount of contributions to the fund. Had the immediate need for such an augmentation continued, we have no doubt the response would have been adequate to the demand. But the unexpected withdrawal from the general co-operation of our esteemed brethren King and Hindle, postponed for a time the necessity of following up this important work.

The receipts—from twenty churches in England, and one in Scotland—have been £123 11s. 6½d. From various individuals in England, Scotland, and Wales, the further sum of £476 10s., making a total of £600 1s. 6½d., as the year's contributions.

Two brethren have been sustained the whole of the year, and four a portion of the year, at a cost (including travelling expenses of Evangelists, Committee expenses, stamps, stationery, printing, &c.) of £491 6s. 7½d.

D. KING's services were given to Liverpool, Chelsea, Wigan, Southport, Manchester, and Birmingham, for the first quarter: at the close of which he intimated his intention of withdrawing from the general work, for reasons afterwards published in the *Harbinger*. Being deeply grieved at the prospect of losing the services of one so universally beloved and honored, we felt it our duty to urge every consideration likely to induce him to remain

in the general field. He, however, thought it his duty to retire, assuring us that he would be no less available for any special work the brethren might wish him to perform and that would not interfere with the requirements of the Birmingham district. Proof of this has been given by the able and effective anti-secularist lectures since delivered in Darwen and Bury, and his ready and abundant labours among the churches.

E. EVANS has again had a wide field of labour. A few days were spent in Wigan. Manchester and Southport received a somewhat larger share of attention. Derby, Nottingham, Bulwell, and the churches in that district, have warmly testified to his strengthening ministry and report twelve baptisms as his fruit from the world. Bedlington also reports eight additions as the result of his labours there. When we consider the deep domestic afflictions under which our dear brother has laboured through a great part of the year, we feel it due to express our tender sympathy with him and our gratitude that he has been enabled to accomplish so much.

W. McDUGALL has spent about five months with the church in Chelsea, giving an occasional visit to Camden Town; also, passing visits to Leicester and Banbury. Several visits have been made to the churches in Bolton, Blackburn, Southport, and Preston, &c., comprising altogether some seven or eight months of labour, in the work of general Evangelization. A number of additions have been made through his ministrations, but his work, especially in Chelsea, has been mainly to cultivate that purity of life, and devotion to the Saviour in the membership, which is the best preparation and only certain method of ensuring large and lasting success. Of the efficiency with which he has performed this work, we have the highest testimony. Could he but have remained to reap the harvest, we probably should have had now to rejoice over a great ingathering of souls.

W. HINDLE's attention was divided between Southport, Preston, and Blackburn, but visits were also made to Liverpool, Wigan, &c. Blackburn reported fourteen baptisms during his stay. When our dear brother made known his intention of leaving England for Australia, we felt extreme regret; and, believing he was leaving a field greatly widening in its promise of usefulness, we sought by every means respectful to his judgment and motives to induce him to remain; but he thought he recognised the voice of his Saviour calling him away, and to obey His will, is the one object of his life. His clarion voice will now proclaim the rich gospel at the Antipodes, and our prayer is that his labours in his new and far distant sphere may be crowned with ever increasing and abundant success.

J. STRANG commenced his year's efforts in Leicester, spending some six weeks there; two weeks were given to Southport, and about three months to Liverpool. Newcastle has occupied about half the year, Ratcliff, one week, and Bedlington three weeks. Though the efforts of Br. Strang have been largely directed to the inward spiritual life of the Church, the value of which brethren have testified in the most emphatic manner, yet thirty-one additions have been credited to his labours.

The meeting on Wednesday morning, after the usual devotional services commenced by the discussion and carrying of the following resolutions—

That the minutes of the Annual Meeting, held in Liverpool, 1869, be approved.

That the Report of the Evangelist Committee be received, and the Treasurer's Accounts be passed.

That the Church at Green Hill Lane be received into the co-operation.

There being applications from several churches with reference to unpleasant circumstances at Nottingham, and the brethren from that place, who were present, indicating that there were no insurmountable obstacles to restoration of cordial relations, it was resolved—

That the brethren in College Street, Nottingham, be recommended to make a direct application to the Church, at Barkergate, for reconciliation; and that if they find they cannot adjust their differences that they be recommended jointly with the Barkergate Church to call in the conciliatory counsels of experienced brethren without and abide by their advice.

B. Ellis, J. B. Rotherham, D. Scott, and J. Adam having been put before the meeting as open to labour, to some extent, in connection with the general fund, it was resolved—

That Brs. Black, Moffitt, Linn, and Manfull, and the present Evangelist Committee, be a Committee (in accordance with the resolutions of last year) to consider and report upon proposals to sustain, in part or altogether, evangelists not now in connection with the General Committee, and that the cases of B. Ellis, J. Adam, D. Scott, and J. B. Rotherham be referred to said committee.

After much careful consideration the committee aforesaid reported, as its unanimous conclusion, that B. Ellis is in every way eligible to labour in connection with the General Committee—that facts relating to J. Adam mark him out as one whose services it is highly desirous to secure—that in some respects there is want of information in regard to D. Scott, and that, therefore, it is desirable to secure his services, under the direction of the Evangelist Committee, for six months, and that the future be then determined—that in the case of J. B. Rotherham it is not desirable to appropriate any portion of the general fund to support him in evangelistic work.

The following resolutions were passed unanimously—

That this meeting in granting the amount applied for by the Brighton Church, requests that Br. Ellis co-operate as far as possible with the Evangelist Committee to the extent of three or four months.

That Br. Scott be invited according to the recommendation of committee to labour with the Evangelist Committee for six months.

That Br. Adam be requested to labor in connection with the Evangelist Committee.

Applications for evangelistic aid came from the following churches—Banbury, Blackburn, Bedlington, Bolton, Brighton, Bulwell, Banff, Dundee, Dumfries, Derby, Chesterfield (for Sheffield), Chelsea, Earlestown, Langley, Liverpool, London, Leicester, New Brinsley, Merthyr Tydvil, Piltown, Preston and Wigan (for Lancashire). The disposition of evangelists was provided for as follows—

That Br. Strang be desired to labour during the year, six months in Scotland and six months in England.

That Br. McDougall be recommended to spend his time in Lancashire and Chelsea.

That Br. Strang be recommended to devote his time in England to Liverpool and Carlisle.

That, considering the numerous applications for evangelistic help and the needs of small churches not actually applying for help, it is desirable that E. Evans and J. Adam act under the direction of the committee for supplying these wants, giving attention to the claims of Bedlington and aid to New Brinsley with its neighbourhood.

The question of the churches adopting, for census and other public documents, one only of the designations of the Church found in the New Testament, having been mooted in letters from eight churches a most interesting discussion took place, showing that thoughtful brethren throughout the country had been searching the Scriptures on this subject. Bren. Black, Tickle, Collin, Evans, King, Moffitt, Rae, Lynn, Paton, Ellis, Hay, and others took part. It was finally resolved—

That the Churches throughout the kingdom be recommended to use in all public documents the name "Church of Christ," and that individuals designate themselves Christians.

The following resolutions sufficiently describe the remaining business—

That a new list of churches be made out by the Secretaries of this Meeting and sent to each church.

That applications for aid in chapel building should be made by the church requiring it direct to the churches and not through the Annual Meeting.

That the officers of various churches in view of the urgent need of more labourers be requested to look out in their midst for young brethren who are eligible and would be willing to go into training for evangelistic work, and to communicate with Br. King when such brethren can be found.

That the best thanks of the brethren be given to Br. and Sister King for their care and trouble in the preparation of our present excellent hymn book.

That the best thanks of this meeting be given to the Evangelist Committee for their services during the past year, urgently requesting them to continue to act for the next twelve months.

That the next Annual Meeting be held in Huddersfield.

That the best thanks of the meeting be given to the brethren in Newcastle for the attention and kindness they have shown to the brethren attending the Annual Meeting.

CONTENTS OF SCHEDULES.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Immersed during the year. | 7. Transferred to Sister Churches. |
| 2. Received from Sister Churches. | 8. Removed to where there are not Churches. |
| 3. Received, having been formerly Immersed | 9. Emigrated. |
| 4. Restored to fellowship. | 10. Present Number of Members. |
| 5. Departed this life. | 11. Number of Teachers. |
| 6. Separated. | 12. Number of Scholars. |

CHURCHES.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<i>England.</i>												
Ashton-under-Lyme				1						8		
Ashford								2		4		
Altrincham												
Banbury		2		1	1	2		5	3	57		
Bath			1	2		4			3	19		
Bedlington	14			1		4	1	4		60	5	40
Birkenhead												
Birmingham (C. Hy. St.)	22	2	1	3	2	10	10	3		210	10	100
" (Sum. Lane)	11	5	2	4	3	20	8	2	3	140	20	110
" (Ick. P. Rd.)	5	15	2			4				54		
Blackburn	19	5		2		2		4	4	42		
Bolton	1					17				27		
Barrow-in-Furness												
Bradford										13		
Brighton	13	1	2		1	7	8		1	90	5	45
Bristol												
Bulwell	1	2	1	3	2		2			90	25	134
Carlisle	9	3			2	3	1	1		56	9	75
Carlton				1	1	2				7		
Chester	2					1				14		
Chesterfield						3				5		
Derby	2	9		2			2			26		
Earlstown	4			1						24	4	26
Frizington												
Golborne	2	1	1				1		4	19		
Hildenboro'					1		1	1		10		
Huddersfield	5	4	1		1	2	4			88		
Kirkby Ireleth	3							4		37		
Langley	1	2			1	2				52	10	40
Leicester	14		2	2	1	26	3	5	1	137	20	119
Lincoln	3			2	2	2	2		2	39		
Liverpool	13	8	1	1	4	7	10	3	5	159		
London (Camden Town)	2	1		1	5	16	1	14	2	153		
" (Chelsea)	18	13	3			8	1		5	93	10	65
" (Islington)												
" (Limehouse)		1			2	18				9		
" (Rotherhithe, late												
Kennington)	6					3	5	2		21		
Loughborough										27		
Louth										10		
Maryport									1	16		
Manchester	4	6				8	6	5	2	158	5	50
Marehay	3						3			8		
Middlesborough	3							2		5		
Mollington										19		
Nettleton (Wilts.)	1				2					20		
New Wortley	4	1			2	2	4	2	2	98		
New Brinsley	3					3		2		22		
Newcastle-upon-Tyne	7	1	3		1			3	1	80	12	50
North Shields	3	1	1			1		1		34		
Nottingham	3	20	1	1	5	4	6	1	3	174	21	130
Oldham	1	5		2		4				18		
Pitldown	1						1	3		77		

CHURCHES.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<i>England.</i>												
Preston												
Ruddington (Notts)		1								12		
Radcliffe Colliery	3	1				1				19		
St. Helens												
Southport	5					2	7		1	21	6	30
Saughall	1									35		
Shrewsbury				2			2		1	28		
Stockport	3				1		1			16		
Wakefield		1				1	2			13		
Wallop												
Wardington							2			9		
Wigan	6	5		3	2	10	3	2	3	187	25	101
Whitehaven	9	1		1	2	3				70	4	30
Wednesbury			2		1	2	1			15		
Wolverhampton		3	1			2	2	5		23		
<i>Scotland.</i>												
Aberdeen				4			2			16		
Auchtermuchty	2						6	1		32		
Armadale	6	2			1	7	9	2		22		
Banff	2				1	6	5	1		78		
Boness												
Carlisle												
Crossgate												
Crofthead												
Cupar												
Dalkeith	2	2	2			1	2	2		58		
Dornock		1	2		1	2	1			20		
Dundee	6			8	1	7	2		5	109		
Dumfries	6		4		1	1	2	3		42	11	50
Edinburgh	13				3	4				126		
Findochty												
Frazerborough												
Glasgow	24	11	2		2		2	5	2	170		
Grangemouth												
Kirkaldy												
Montrose												
New Pit Sligo												
Peikie Mill (by St. And.)												
Portsoy (Banff)												
Sanquhar										20		
Turriff												
<i>Ireland.</i>												
Mullaghmore	1	2		1	1	2	3		1	53		
<i>Wales.</i>												
Bangor										5		
Brecon												
Buckley (near Mold)												
Oam-yr-Alyn		2			1					14		
Cefn Mawr					3					67		
Criccieth	2		1									
Glyn Ceiriog												
Llanfair												
Llanidloes					1				2	12		
Merthyr Tidvil										9		
Moss (near Wrexham)												
Penmachno												
Portmadoc		1		1				1		39		
Rhos Llanerchrugog	2			2	2	1	3		1	42	7	35
Swansea				2				1		4		
Tredegar										4		
Wrexham (King street) ...	1	2	1		1	1	1			59		
„ (Temple row)									1	15		

On Wednesday evening B. Ellis and D. King addressed a considerable assembly. On Thursday evening a large company of brethren and others, presided over by R. Black, of London, was addressed by Brn. Scott, Hay, Adam, Collin, Linn, Tickle, Sinclair, Rae, and Forsyth.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

WALES.—The meeting of Brethren to confer upon establishing an Evangelist Fund for Wales, was held in the Chapel, Rhos Llanerchrugog, on May 3rd, 1870. There were present brethren from Criccieth, Cam-yr-Alyn, Cox Lane, Cefn Mawr, Liverpool, Merthyr Tydvil, Portmadoc, Wrexham, &c. E. Morris of Wrexham, was chosen to preside. Letters were read from Bangor, Buckley, Criccieth, Cam-yr-Alyn, Cefn Mawr, Llanidloes, Llanfair, Mollington, Portmadoc, Penmachno, Rhos, Swansea, and Wrexham, which expressed concurrence in the movement, and the great need for earnest labourers in both languages.

W. Williams, of Criccieth, as Treasurer *pro tem*, having presented a report showing the amount already subscribed for the purpose, and the brethren present having reported the amounts which the Churches they represented would contribute to the fund yearly, it was resolved—

That a suitable brother approved of by this meeting, be engaged to labour in Wales for such time as the funds will support him, and that we earnestly request the ensuing Annual General Meeting kindly to render such assistance as will enable us to sustain him throughout the year.

That W. Williams, of Tredegar, be engaged to labour as an Evangelist, in the Welsh language, pursuant to the preceding resolution.

That a committee consisting of W. Jones, J. Ellis, and J. Davies, of Portmadoc; W. Williams, of Criccieth, W. Watkins, of Llanfair, O. Thomas, of Cefn Mawr, and R. Davies, of Rhos, be appointed to receive and disburse contributions, confer with the Evangelist as to time and place of his labours, and to render him such assistance, advice, counsel, &c., as circumstances may require.

That W. Williams, of Criccieth, be requested to act as Treasurer, and J. T. Morgan, of Merthyr, as Secretary to the Committee during the ensuing year.

That an annual meeting of brethren in Wales be held, the time and place of next meeting to be fixed by the Evangelist Committee.

The meetings for worship and preaching were full of interest. Lord's day morning, May 1st, the Church was addressed by W. Williams, of Criccieth, J. T. Morgan, R. Davies, and D. Williams. W. Williams, and J. T. Morgan, preached in the Afternoon, and W. Williams, and E. Morris, in the evening. On Monday evening W. Williams, of Tredegar, and W. Jones, of Portmadoc, proclaimed the gospel. On Tuesday evening a large audience was addressed by W. Williams, of Criccieth, and W. Jones, of Portmadoc. Nearly the whole of the brethren remained together for dinner and tea on Tuesday, ample provision having been made for so doing at the house of Br. Davies.

The love which pervaded the meetings of the brethren was marked, and we separated well pleased with the inauguration of a movement which we trust will, under the blessing of God, be of great importance to the cause of the truth in the Principality.

J. T. M.

BIRMINGHAM; *Charles Henry Street*.—The peace of our Church has been unbroken, and we rejoice in the knowledge that love has to a great extent reigned in our midst.

Since your last gathering the churches in this district have deemed it wise to form themselves into an association for evangelistic purposes. This took place about ten months since. At that time Br. King terminated his arrangements with the General Evangelist Committee and consented to spend about nine months of the year in this district.

We are pleased to say that the contributions from the churches and from the brethren in the association have hitherto more than supplied the requisite funds. With increased means we hope to employ other evangelistic aid in the district.

The association now comprises the three churches in Birmingham, and those in Wolverhampton, Wednesbury, Leicester, and Bridgenorth.

Our schedule will inform you that there has been a small increase in the number of our members. We trust that the Lord will enable us to achieve greater results in the ensuing year.

We are building a room at the rear of our chapel in which to hold our weekly meetings and for school purposes, the members of this church supplying funds by donations and periodical contributions.

We gratefully present to the Annual Meeting, to the churches, and to the brethren generally our warmest thanks for the large amount of evangelistic aid which has been given to us in past years, chiefly in the protracted services of Br. King who was so long sustained here by the general fund; and we ask you to join with us in thanking our Heavenly Father, that the help has not been in vain, but that we are now as a result able to provide such aid from our own resources."

BULWELL.—We heartily thank the Committee for sending Br. Evans into this district. His labours have been acceptable and very successful in two of the churches. Should we be asking too much—Would it encroach on the claims of other churches—were we to ask for his stay to be prolonged? His continuance among us a short time longer is very needful and would, with God's blessing, be productive of great good on behalf of the church, and, I can truly say, of the churches in the district.—**WM. J. DAWSON.**

GREEN HILL LANE, DERBYSHIRE.—Four or five of us from Bulwell began to meet here in January, 1868, and have continued to the present. We are thankful to God that His word, faithfully preached, has made a deep impression upon many who have heard it. Several have confessed their faith in Jesus and been baptized into Him. We now number twenty-three and live in hope of many more.—**J. HEAPS.**

THE ANNUAL MEETING AND THE PRESS.

WHILE at the Annual Meeting in Newcastle, I could not help being impressed with the vital importance of its concluding deliberations concerning the power of the "Press" to spread abroad the truth among the people, and the apathy of the brotherhood generally, with reference to this. Noble exceptions there are doubtless, but, as a people, we have not risen up to a full appreciation of the power of written words to tell the story of the cross and diffuse the light of Primitive Christianity over the land. With all our claims to be considered as the bearers of Apostolic light and the ancient gospel in its purity, we can well afford in the preaching of it to copy the example of many of our neighbours—the Mormons, Irvingites, &c., &c. In every corner of our land, in city and hamlet, the public are met with their literature, in tract and pamphlet. Thomasism, alias Christadelphianism, although possessing few public preachers, yet by the potency of written words in the hands of earnest disciples, is drawing unwary fish into the net of speculation and error. By the munificence of friends, who have means, every simple brother at a distance is supplied with tracts, &c.; at low cost, often gratis, to distribute at meetings, and among friends. Verily the ancient zeal of the Ana-baptists is being revived around us, and the children of sectarianism are wiser and more earnest than disciples of Christ, in going about everywhere preaching the word. Of Wesleyan, Mormon, and Christadelphian; Melancthon, if alive, might well say now, as he did concerning the troublesome Ana-baptists of his own time, "One cannot meet with them but they are always ramming a text of Scripture down ones throat." Now the zeal is admirable, although the impertinence of the "ramming" might be well modified by "speaking the truth in love" as Paul tells us.

Such examples, brethren, call us to action. If we have the truth on our side, primitive doctrine to teach the people, let us also, as Bro. Linn said at the meeting, have primitive activity in making it known. Rest assured we can never progress as we ought until we rise up to a full sense of the power of literature to make known the truth. Our *Harbinger*, our *Old Paths*, our *Sunbeam*, and other pamphlets advocating New Testament principles, might have double their present circulation if only the elders in our churches and the leading spirits would at once form tract committees, and enlist the sympathies—first love, of young disciples in the work of

distribution. By so doing the labour of evangelists would be greatly furthered and the hearts of the people prepared to receive the truth in the love of it. In this way we could realize the perfection of evangelistic effort, and by the earnest, active, and loving action of all the brotherhood, by tongue and pen, arrest the attention of our fellows to the Great Salvation.

Bro. Clarke of Lincoln bore testimony to the efficacy of the *Old Paths* as a converting agency, stating the number of souls saved by its means.

Brethren, what it has done in that neighborhood it can do beside you, if like earnestness mark your efforts. "I haven't time to give away tracts" says some one. Well, but have you the means? If so, then forward your order for a number, and place them in the hands of some one who *can* distribute them. There are a good many noble-hearted brethren over the kingdom like the delegate from Carlisle, who, while unable to pay for tracts, are quite willing if supplied to circulate them over the country for five miles around their own homes. You have the means then, brother or sister, and hands are waiting for the tracts. May the love of Christ constrain you to send them forth. That the faith of all in the power of written words to permeate the heart of society and leaven the masses with the life-giving principles of the faith of Christ may be increased, read the following words on the subject from the pen of a popular writer:—"It is my conviction that more will have to be done through the press * * * Tracts can go everywhere. Tracts know no fear. Tracts never tire. Tracts never die. Tracts can be multiplied without end by the press. Tracts can travel at little expense. They run up and down like the angels of God, blessing all, giving to all, and asking for no gift in return. They can talk to one as well as to a multitude; and to a multitude as well as to one. They require no public room to tell their story in; they can tell it in the kitchen or in the shop, in the parlor or in the closet, in the railway carriage or in the omnibus, on the broad highway or in the footpath through the fields. They take no note of scoffs, or jeers, or taunts. No one can betray them into random or hasty expressions. Though they will not always answer questions, they will tell their story twice, or thrice, or four times over if you wish them. And they can be made to speak on every subject, and on every subject they may be made to speak wisely and well. They can, in short, be made vehicles of all truth; the teachers of all classes; the benefactors of all lands."

Arise then, brethren, and in the strength of God and with love for perishing sinners and use them

"Sow in the morn thy seed,
At eve hold not thy hand;
To doubt and fear give thou no heed,
Broad cast it o'er the land."

J. ADAM.

IS THE RELIGION OF THE AGE APOSTOLIC?

AMONG imperfect beings, we might expect deterioration, from the powerful influence of the world, the flesh and the tempter. These might abate the warmth of our love and zeal felt in the days of our espousal to Christ. But these should not change the great principles of the system, and turn heart-religion into lip-service, form and ceremonies.

Let us look at some of the differences. We take human authority, for our guide, instead of inspired truth. "What saith the Scripture, and how

readest thou," were the inquiries of primitive Christians; not what is your opinion or that of Dr. A. Have we not established creed and confessions, the words of which are taken in a very small measure from the Scriptures? Do we not so dilute Bible teaching by human interpolations, as do faithless traders their wares, so that they are known only by the labels instead of their qualities? Do we not teach many dogmas not found in the Bible? Jesus said, "Whatsoever I have commanded;" but we dare not aver that we have adhered to his instructions; for our creeds are swelled to monstrous proportions, having now and then only a Scriptural phrase. But the early Christians searched the Bible in order to ascertain the meaning of the instructions, not the creeds and enactments of men.

The current orthodoxy and primitive teaching differ. Our appeal now is to Calvin, or Arminius, the infallible Pope, the great doctors of the present day, instead of Christ and the apostles. If there be as many orthodoxies as sects in religion, then their name is "Legion," and how can inquirers after truth amidst a thousand learned instructors, ever reach the true point? But orthodoxy, like the chameleon, changes oftener than the phases of the moon. But if we adhered only to the Bible, we should not be perplexed in seeking and knowing what orthodoxy is—there would be but one guide. We might hope for union and fellowship, if guided by one Book. Christians will never be *one* according to the prayer of the Saviour till they abandon all teachers but one.

Traditions and learned interpretations have taken the place of the plain, positive instructions of the King in Zion. Jesus blamed the Jews for perverting the word of God by their traditions, and of inculcating these instead of his commands. How ingeniously they tried to palliate their crime; the son has devoted his property to the temple, and hence, is under no obligation to honor or support his parents. Traditions, the false interpretations of learned men, have a more wonderful influence on us than the plain word of God. The renowned Doctor B. says the meaning is so and so, and I admit his interpretation because it accords better with my preconceived notions and parental instructions. So large were the letters on guide-posts in early times, that the courser could read while running; so is it true in regard to the way to Heaven by the Evangelists.

Ritualism was unknown to primitive Christians. If all that is necessary to salvation has been prescribed by the Saviour and apostles, shall we dare to multiply forms and ceremonies? If it is presumed that Christ did not know what was requisite, you impeach his wisdom; if it is imagined he refused or failed to prescribe, you impeach his goodness; hence, it follows, that all rules for the guide and comfort of his people are contained in the sacred oracles. These contain the ordinances, rites, materials, officers and authority in the primitive churches. It is impertinent in us to multiply them; it is a work of supererogation and well may the judge inquire, "Who hath required this at your hands?" We may think that multiplying rites will increase the ardour of piety and advance religion, but the general tendency is to fritter it down to cold formalism—lip-service, and kill all that is spiritual and pleasing to God. The Corinthians contended about ceremonies, but Paul assured them, "we have no such custom, nor the churches of God."

These have been introduced since primitive times, and hence, create a marked difference between the apostolic age and this. The tone of religious sentiment, the spirit of piety, is very much lower than in the early ages.

Some churches, so-called, have introduced sacraments, ordinances, and officers without number, and formulas of worship so numerous that a

volume is requisite to contain them and explain their use. Some of these have been substituted for the real commands of the Saviour, having no likeness to the originals, and would have been unintelligible to the early church members.

Under the influence of these incumbrances and human traditions, what else than deterioration and loss of primeval power could be anticipated? A very small particle will impede the rapidity of some of our most powerful machinery; but multiply these, though small in size, they will clog the wheels so that they come to a dead halt or run very slowly; so with the churches of the present day. The pristine power of apostolic times has been muffled and restrained by these ceremonies, and the zeal which burned in every Christian heart has been cooled or entirely extinguished. When Moses was in the mount, the people desired a god to go before them—the heathens, in the days of Elisha, called upon their gods in vain, when they were told sarcastically, that they were asleep or on a journey. Ritualism probably had its origin here. On the mount of transfiguration, the Father said, "This is my beloved Son, hear him." When this is obeyed there will be a universal *oneness* among the disciples of Jesus.—*Central Baptist*.

Family Room.

WONDERS OF THE ATMOSPHERE.

THE atmosphere rises above us with its ethereal dome arching toward heaven, of which it is the most perfect synonym and symbol. It floats around us like that grand object which the apostle John saw in his vision, "a sea of glass like unto a crystal." So massive is it, that when it begins to stir. It tosses about great ships like playthings, and sweeps city and forest like snow-flakes to destruction before it.

And yet it is so mobile that we have lived for years in it before we can be persuaded that it exists at all, and the great bulk of mankind never realize the truth that they are bathed in an ocean of air. Its weight is so enormous that iron shivers before it like glass, yet a soap ball sails through it with impunity, and the tiniest insect waves it aside with its wing. It ministers lavishly to all our senses. We touch it not, but it touches us. Its warm south wind brings back colour to the pale face of the invalid; its cool west winds refresh the fevered brow and make

the blood mantle to our cheeks; even its north blasts brace into new vigour the hardened children of our rugged climate.

The eye is indebted to it for all the magnificence of sunrise, the brightness of midday, the chastened radiance of the morning, and the clouds that cradle near the setting sun. But for it, the rainbow would want its "triumphant arch," and the winds would not send the fiery messengers on errands around the heavens; the cold ether would not send snow feathers on the earth, nor would drops of dew gather on the flowers. The kindly rain would never fall, nor hailstorm nor fog diversify the face of the sky; our naked globe would turn its tanned and unshadowed forehead to the sun; and one dreary, monotonous blaze of light and heat dazzle and burn up all things!

Were there no atmosphere, the evening sun would in a moment set, and, without warning, plunge the earth into darkness. But the air keeps in her hand a shield of her

rays, and lets them slip but slowly through her fingers, so that the shadows of evening are gathered by degrees, and the flowers have time to bow their heads, and each creature space to find a place of rest, and to nestle to repose. In the morning, the garish sun would at one bound burst from the bosom of the night, and blaze above the horizon ;

but the air watches for his coming, and sends first but one little ray to announce his approach, and then another, and then a handful ; and so gently draws aside the curtain of night, and slowly lets the light fall on the face of the sleeping earth, and like man she goes forth again to labour until evening.— *Quarterly Review*.

LET THERE BE NO ENVYINGS.

As rust consumes iron, so envy corrupts man. It is an ill-natured vice, and is made up of meanness and malice. It wishes the force of goodness to be strained, and the measure of happiness abated. It laments prosperity, and sickens at the sight of health. It is of all things the most ungratifying. There is power for ambition and pleasure for learning, but envy gets no reward save vexation ; therefore let us put away pride and envy, and let us rejoice in the well-doing and well-being of each other. Let us esteem others better than ourselves ; for while we are disposed to envy others, we may possess some blessing they have not. Therefore let each of us rejoice within ourselves, and imitate our Lord Jesus, who envied none,

but found happiness in knowing, loving, and serving the living God.

How sweet, how heavenly is the sight,
When those who love the Lord,
Do in each other's peace delight,
And thus fulfill His word ;
When free from envy, scorn, and pride
Our wishes all above,
Each can his brother's failings hide,
And show a brother's love.

Let each of us apply the lesson to our own hearts, and learn of the Lord Jesus Christ, who so humbled Himself that He came from heaven to suffer the envy of all the world for our sakes, and to teach us how to bear with each other, and to lift up our weaker brethren, and not to trample them down with our envy and scorn. If our hearts be right we shall use our best efforts to bring erring ones back to the foot of the Cross.— *Free Gospel Magazine*.

LITTLE HUNGRY MINDS.

EVERY parent knows what is meant by this. That incessant asking of questions, so characteristic of children, is annoying at times, it must be admitted. But seek not to wholly stifle the child's desire to ask questions. A process of education is going on in the little mind, which it is desirable to encourage by every possible means. Under the child's strange questions may lurk a meaning which even the philosopher cannot penetrate. Refuse to satisfy the intellectual hunger of the little mind, and the appetite for knowledge, the disposition to observe, to speculate,

to wonder, to inquire, may suffer. The little earnest efforts discouraged, may nip in the bud those aspirations of the immature intellect, which might have led in the process of years, to the fulness and the glory of the ripened mind. Bear, then, with the little hungry mind ; and, at proper periods, and in every proper way, endeavour to satisfy its restless curiosity. For in this way shall the healthy mental activity of the child be kept up, and its mind preserved from becoming a barren waste, or from producing only noxious and poisonous weeds. And though chil-

dren's questions may seem trivial, or even meaningless, depend upon it they are not so. Sympathy with the child—the habit of looking at things from its point of view, of entering into its ideas and feelings, will soon convince any one of the truth of this; and, besides, prove by

no means an unprofitable exercise. For by sympathy with the little mind, we catch something of its healthy hunger, something of the freshness of its desires; and thus may we ourselves be greatly benefited whilst promoting the best interests of our children.—*Selected.*

MARRIAGE MAXIMS.

THE following "marriage maxims" are worthy of more than a hasty reading. Husbands need not pass them by, for they are designed for wives; and wives should not despise them, for they are addressed to husbands:—

The very nearest approach to domestic happiness on earth is in the cultivation of unselfishness.

Never talk at one another either alone or in company.

Never both be angry at once.

Never speak loud to one another, unless the house is on fire.

Let each one strive to yield oftenest to the wishes of the other.

Let self-denial be the daily aim and practice of each.

Never find fault, unless it is perfectly certain that a fault has been committed, and always speak lovingly.

Never taunt with a past mistake.

Never make a remark at the

expense of each other, it is a meanness.

Never part for the day without loving words to think of during absence.

Never let the sun go down upon any anger or grievance.

Never let any fault you have committed go by until you have frankly confessed it and asked forgiveness.

Never forget the happy hours of early love.

Never sigh over what might have been, but make the best of what is.

Never forget that marriage is ordained of God, and that His blessing alone can make it what it should ever be.

Never be contented till you know both are walking in the narrow way.

Never let your hopes stop short of the eternal home.—*Cottager and Artisan.*

THE GOLDEN SIDE.

THERE is many a rest on the road of life,

If we only would stop to take it;

And many a tone from the better land,

If the querulous heart would make it.

To the sunny soul that is full of hope,

And whose beautiful trust ne'er faileth,

The grass is green and the flowers are bright

Though the wintry storm prevaieth.

Better to hope, though clouds hang low,

And to keep the eyes still lifted;

For the sweet blue sky will soon break through

When the ominous clouds are rifted;

There was never a night without a day,

Or an evening without a morning;

And the darkest hour as the proverb goes,

Is the hour before the dawning.

There is many a gem in the path of life,
Which we pass in our idle pleasure,
That is richer far than the jewelled crown,
Or the miser's hoarded treasure ;
It may be the love of a little child,
Or a mother's prayers to heaven,
Or only a beggar's grateful thanks
For a cup of water given.

Better to weave in the web of life
A bright and golden filling,
And to do God's will with a ready heart,
And hands that are swift and willing,
Than to snap the delicate minute threads
Of our curious life asunder,
And then blame Heaven for the tangled ends,
And sit and grieve and wonder.

Selected.

BUSINESS MEANS OF GRACE.

Instead of business becoming a feeder to covetousness, under the promptings of nature, it must become a stimulus to benevolence, under the promptings of grace. Dr. Hawes, in his biography of Normand Smith, a merchant in his congregation, says he never grew in grace more rapidly, or shone brighter as a Christian, than during the last six or seven years of his life, when he had the greatest amount of business on his

hands. From the time when he devoted all to God, and resolved to pursue his business as a part of his religion, he found no tendency in his worldly engagements to chill his piety or enchain his affections to earth. His business became to him a means of grace, and helped him forward in the divine life just as truly as reading the Scriptures and prayer.

DEBATE—C. BRADLAUGH AND D. KING.

For several years Secularists have been calling upon Mr. King to engage Mr. Bradlaugh in public debate. As often as they have done so they have been told that Mr. K., though not desirous to meet Mr. B., declares himself quite willing, providing his published conditions of debate are accepted. Correspondence has again and again been renewed, but each time only to end in Mr. Bradlaugh dropping himself out or refusing to complete arrangements. For the last year or so he has tried another move that of creating the impression that Mr. King is of too small importance to engage the attention of the great Iconoclast, who, we are gravely informed in a recent *National Reformer*, is six feet three quarters of an inch high. Mr. King, according to him, is nobody ; represents nobody ; is an heretic ; there is no inducement to accept unfair terms at his hand ; will debate with him if six ministers, including two of the clergy of the Church of England, will sign a paper acknowledging him as their representative ; he is shoved out of all the churches ; he would not be accepted by the Church of England and the Independents would not acknowledge him ; until he gets the Darwen clergy to back him we shall let him alone ; it is not worth while to occupy space with David King, as the clergy will not endorse him and his own merits do not entitle him. These and like flattering intimations have been published by Mr. Bradlaugh. Ever and anon Mr. King has been favoured with some brief notice, in the *Reformer*, by way of proving to its readers that he is not worth notice. These allusions have not been in reply to communications from Mr. King, for he has long since abstained from communicating to that paper. But somehow people would keep stirring Mr. Bradlaugh up and his own friends would not let him alone on the subject. He, therefore, thus continued to notice the man who is not worth notice, because he could not help himself.

Well, then, is the matter at an end? Bradlaugh declares he will let him alone till the Darwen clergy back him, and no step has been taken to procure their endorsement; nor would their appointment be accepted, for Mr. King appears as the representative of something immeasurably higher than the Darwen clergymen, however worthy and estimable those gentlemen may be. To appear as their representative would be to place upon his shoulders the burden of the State Church, and that, with an opponent over *his feet*, would be about as intolerable as was the armour of Saul to David of old. Mr. Bradlaugh has surpassing fondness for clergymen of the state church: we need not say why.

But the matter is not at an end. There is to be a debate. Mr. King's "unfair" and "absurd" conditions are all accepted: nine nights are fixed for the discussion; Mr. Bradlaugh *cannot* let him alone till the Darwen clergymen make him their champion; Mr. Bradlaugh is to have nothing but his travelling expenses, unless his own friends please to compensate him; the debate is to be printed, and Mr. Bradlaugh is to revise his speeches for that purpose; no portion of the debate is to appear in the *National Reformer* without Mr. King's consent. The questions are—

1. What is Christianity?
2. Is it of Divine origin?
3. What are its legitimate effects?
4. What is Secularism? and what can it do for man that Christianity can not?
5. Is the Bible account of Creation opposed to reason and science?

The discussion is to take place in Bury, Lancashire, on September 27, 28, 29, 30, and October 25, 26, 27, 28, 29. The Co-operative Hall is taken for the purpose. A charge of two-pence will be made each evening for admission, and the proceeds, after paying expenses, will go to the National Lifeboat Institution.

The foregoing was partly in type for last month but could not appear from want of space. It is given now in answer to those correspondents who complain of our consenting to meet Mr. Bradlaugh. The reasons assigned against so doing, looked at from one point of view only, might warrant absolute refusal; but then, Secularists make him their president and pass by superior men to honour him. We seek him not, they push him upon us. When, then, he complied with all the conditions we had put forth it was due to them to accept the man of their choice. If he is what our correspondents intimate Secularists must take the consequence of being so represented. D. K.

Obituary.

THOMASINA HALLIDAY PERKINS, wife of Bro. J. H. Perkins, Tuturau, Otago, New Zealand, fell asleep in Jesus. She was suddenly taken ill on the evening of May 14th, and expired on the following afternoon. She was a kind mother, an affectionate wife, and a consistent member of the Church of Christ with which she has been connected for eight years. She has left with her sorrowing husband seven children, to deplore her loss. J. WATT.

JANE BEASTALL after several years illness fell asleep in Jesus, June 23rd, 1870, at the age of 32 years. Was a member of the Church in Green Hill Lane, Derbyshire. J. H.

On Tuesday, the 2nd August, Sister J. W. MACKIE, Dundee, fell asleep in the Lord Jesus, after three day's serious illness. Sister Mackie had reached her 62nd year, and was the daughter of the late James Ainslie, who, since the formation of the

Church in Dundee, occupied the senior office in the pastorate till his death, a little more than two years ago. She embraced primitive christianity in June, 1834, and was ever exemplary in her profession as a follower of her Lord. Borne down by long weakness and frequent affliction she was unable for very many years to enjoy the communion of the brethren on the Lord's days; but this, instead of marring her life of resignation and holiness, only helped her to prepare herself more thoroughly for the enjoyment of those blissful regions where sabbaths never end. The closing moments of her life, which were witnessed by her family and her brother, and several brethren and sisters were beautiful though solemn, and calmly she passed away from this world into the enjoyment of "that peace which passeth all understanding," having the blessed assurance of being a partaker of a glorious immortality. J. M.

A SERVANT OF JESUS CHRIST.

"ELEANOR and Mr. Rhys sat down on the moss at the foot of the trees which gave both shade and rest."

'Now if you want refreshment,' said Mr. Rhys, 'I can give it to you, but only of one kind.'

'I don't know—I should say of several kinds,' said Eleanor, looking into the basket—'but the quality doubtful.'

'Did you think I meant *that*?'

Eleanor laughed at the earnest gravity of this speech. 'Mr. Rhys I saw no other refreshment you had to offer me; but indeed I do not want any—more than I am taking.'

'I was going to offer it to you of another kind, but there is no kind like it. What is your way of reading the Bible?'

'I have no particular *way*,' said Eleanor in some surprise. 'I read several chapters a day—or at least always a chapter at morning and evening. What *way* do you mean?'

'There are a great many ways; and it is good to use them all at different times. But what way would be good for a half hour's refreshment at such a time as this?'

'I am sure I don't know, I have no way but the one.'

'Yes, but we should not have seen the 'Bandel' of Helig, if we had not turned aside to look at it; and you would not have heard the blackbird and the wren, perhaps, unless you had stopped to listen to them. I suppose we have missed a million of other things for want of looking.'

'Yes, but we could not look at everything all along these miles of way.'

'Very true. On the other hand, if we go but a very little way we can examine all around us. Have you a Bible with you?'

'No, I never carry one.'

'I am better off than you. Let us try a little of this—the first chapter of Romans. Will you read the first verse and consider it?'

He handed her the Bible and Eleanor read—

"Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God."

'What do you find there?' said her companion.

'Not much. The verse seems to be a sort of opening, or introduction to the rest. Paul tells who he is, or what he is.'

'And what does he say?'

'A servant of Jesus Christ.'

'You think that is not much?'

'Certainly, it is much, in itself; but here I took it for a mere statement of fact.'

'But what a fact! *A servant of Jesus Christ*. Only that! Do you know what a fact that is? What is it to be a servant of Jesus Christ?'

Without waiting for the answer, which was not ready, Mr. Rhys rose up from his seat and began an abstracted exploration of the bit of woodland at the edge of which they had been sitting; wandering in and out among the trees, and stooping now and then to pluck a flower or a fern, or to examine one; apparently too full of his thoughts to be quiet. Eleanor heard him sometimes and watched him when she could; he was very busy; she wished he would give some of his thoughts to her.

'I thought you wanted rest, Mr. Rhys,' she said boldly, when she got a chance. 'Please sit down here and take it along with your other refreshment.' He smiled, and came immediately with a bunch of myosotis

in his hand, which he threw into Eleanor's lap; and turning to her, he repeated very seriously his question—

'What is it to be a servant of Jesus Christ?

'I know very little,' said Eleanor timidly. 'I am only just beginning to learn.'

'You know the words bring for our refreshment only the meaning we attach to them—except so far as the Holy Spirit answering our prayers and endeavours shows us new meaning and depth that we had not known before.'

'Of course—but I suppose I know very little. These words convey only the mere fact to me.'

'Let us weigh the words. A servant is a follower. Christ said, "If a man serve me, let him *follow me*."

'Yes—I know.'

'A follower must know where his master goes. How did Christ walk?'

'He went about doing good.'

'He did; but mark, there are different ways of doing that. Get to the root of the matter. The young man who kept all the commandments from his youth was not following Christ; and when it came to the pinch, he turned his back upon him.'

'How then, Mr. Rhys? You mean heart-following?'

'That is what the Lord means. Look here—Paul says, in the ninth verse, "Whom I serve with MY SPIRIT in the gospel." Following cannot have a different end in view from that of the person followed. And what was Christ's?—"My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work." Are we servants of Christ after that rule, Miss Powle?'

The question had a singular intonation, as if the questioner were charging it home upon himself. Yet Eleanor knew he could answer it in the affirmative, and that she could not; she sat silent without looking up. The old contrast of character recurred to her, in spite of the fact that her own had changed so much. She hung over the book, while her companion half abstractedly repeated—

"My meat is to do the will of him that sent me." That makes a way of life of great simplicity.'

'Is it always easy to find?' ventured Eleanor.

'Very!—if His will is all that we desire.'

'But that is a very searching deep question.'

'Let it search, then. 'My meat is to do the will of Him.' No matter what that may be, Miss Powle; our choice lies in this—that it is His will. And as soon as we set our hearts upon one or other particular sort of work, or labour, in any particular place, or even upon any given measure of success attending our efforts, so that we are not willing to have Him reverse our arrangements—we are getting to have too much will about it.'

Eleanor looked up with some effort.

'You are making it a great matter, to be a true servant of Christ, Mr. Rhys.'

'Would you have it a little matter?' he said with a smile of great brightness and sweetness. 'Let the Lord have all. He was among us "as one that serveth"—amid discouragements and disappointments, and abuse; and he has warned us that the servant is not greater than his Lord. It is not a little thing to be a minister of Jesus Christ.'

'Now you are getting out of the general into the particular.'

'No, I am not; a *minister* is but a servant; what we call a minister, is but in a more emphatic degree the servant of all. The rules of service

are the same for him and for others. Let us look at another one. Here it is, in John.' And the fingers that Eleanor had watched came turning over the leaves. "Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye ought also to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." One thing is plain from that, Miss Eleanor—we are not to consider ourselves too good for anything.'

'No,' said Eleanor; 'but I suppose that does not forbid a just judgment of ourselves or of others in respect of adaptations and qualifications.'

'Yes it does,' he said quickly. 'The only question is, has the Lord put that work in your hands? If he has, never ask whether your hands are the right ones. He knows. What our Lord stooped to do, well may we.'

Eleanor dared not to say more; she knew of what he was thinking; whether he had a like intuition with respect to her thoughts she did not know, and would not risk them any nearer discovery.

'There is another thing about being a servant of Christ, it ensures some kind and degree of persecution.'

'Do you think so, in these days?' said Eleanor. 'Why it is thought praiseworthy and honourable, is it not, through all the land, to be good? to be a member of the church, and to fulfil the requirements of religion. Does anybody lose respect or liking from such a cause?'

'No. But he suffers persecution. My dear friend, what are the requirements of religion? We are just considering them. Can you remember a servant of Christ, such as we have seen the name means, in your knowledge, whom the world allowed to live in peace?'

Eleanor was silent.

"Remember the word that I said unto you, the servant is not greater than his Lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will also keep yours."

'But in these days, Mr. Rhys?' said Eleanor doubtfully.

'I can only say, that if you are of the world, the world will love its own. I know no other way of securing that result. "Because ye are not of the world," Jesus said, "but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." And it is declared elsewhere, that all that will live godly in Jesus Christ shall suffer persecution. Can you remember any instance to the contrary?'

Eleanor looked up, and gave Mr. Rhys a good view of her honest eyes; they were very intent now and somewhat sorrowful.

'Mr. Rhys except in Plassey, I do not know such persons as you ask me about.'

'Is it possible!' He said.

'Mr. Rhys, I was thinking the servants of Christ have good need of that "helmet of salvation" 'I used to wish for.'

'Well, they have it!' he said brightly. "If any man serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be." 'That is the end of all. But there is another point of service that occurs to me. We have seen that we must not please ourselves; I recollect that in another place Paul says, that if he pleased men, he would not be the servant of Christ. There is a point where he and the world would come in contact of opposition.'

'But I thought we ought to please everybody as much as we could?' He smiled, put his hand over and turned two or three leaves of the Bible

which she kept open at the first of Romans, and pointed to a word in the fifteenth chapter. "Let every one of us please his neighbour, for his good to edification."

'There is your limit,' said he. 'So far thou mayest go, but no farther. And to do that you will find requires quite sufficiently that you should not please yourself. And now how shall we do all this?—how shall we be all this?'

'You are asking the very question!' said Eleanor gravely.

'We must come to the root and spring of all this service and following—it is our love of the Lord himself. That will do it, and nothing else will. "What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ."

'But suppose one is deficient in that very thing? Suppose one wants that love?'

'Ay!' he said, looking into her face with his eyes of light,—suppose one does; what then?'

'Eleanor could not bear them; her own eyes fell.'

'What is one to do?' Mr. Rhys had risen up before he answered in his deliberate accents—

"Seek him that maketh the seven stars and Orion, and turneth the shadow of night into morning."

He paced slowly up and down before Eleanor; then went off upon a rambling search through the wood again; seeming to be busy with little things in his way. Eleanor sat still. After a little he came and stood before her with a bunch of ferns and melic grass and lilies of the valley, which he was ordering in his hand as he spoke.

'The effect of our following Christ in this way, Miss Powle, will be, that we shall bear testimony to the world that he is our King, and what sort of a King he is. We shall proclaim that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. We shall have the invisible army of angels for our fellow servants and co-workers; and we shall be passing on with the whole redeemed world to the day of full triumph and final restoration; and when Christ will come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in them that believe—because our testimony among you was believed. But now our business is to give the testimony.'

He walked up and down, up and down, before Eleanor for some minutes, in a thoughtful, abstracted way. Eleanor felt his manner as much as his words; the subject had clearly gone home to herself. She felt both so much that she did not like to interrupt the silence, nor to look up. At last he stopped again before her, and said in quite a different tone.

'What are the next words, Miss Powle?'

"Called to be an apostle!"

'We shall not get home to dinner, if we go into that,' he said smiling.'

'You have preached a sermon to me, Mr. Rhys.'

'I do that often to myself,' he answered.

'To yourself?' said Eleanor.

'Yes, nobody needs it more.'

'But when you have so much real preaching to do, I should think it would be the last thing you would wish to do in private, at other times.'

'For that very reason, I need to have a sermon always ready, and to be always ready myself. Now let us get home and look at our 'Rotifera'—if we have any.'

"The Old Helmet."

THE LIFE OF LOVE.

"NONE of us liveth to himself," say Paul. Whether we regard this as the annunciation of a social law, inevitable in its operations, or as the statements of a principle of Christian life, it is, in either case, strictly true. From the very constitution of social life, no man, how intense soever his selfishness, can live merely to himself. His presence, his example, the very atmosphere of his being, lends a blight to other lives, taints other spirits, and resists the spread of goodness and benevolence. It should cause every one who lives falsely to tremble when he thinks that, whether he will or not, he is involving others in the fatal consequences of his own falseness, and dragging them from worthy heights to the base level of his own unworthy life.

But we take it that in this connection the apostle is rather enunciating the grand principle of Christian life—not the inevitable working of a law, but the true inspiration and purpose of a regenerate nature. The death of Christ, subjectively viewed, is designed, in everyone who appropriates its treasures of infinite love, to purge the heart of selfishness and inspire it with benevolence. "He died for all, that they who live should no longer *live to themselves*, but to Him who died for them and rose again." "God is Love." He is not said to be wisdom, nor power, nor justice, nor vengeance, but love. Wisdom is Love planning happiness and honour for his creatures. Power is Love executing the plans that wisdom has devised. Justice and vengeance are but Love keeping order in the universe, and preventing, at the least cost of suffering, any invasion of the order and happiness of God's creation. Essentially, therefore, God is Love: and we can only become children of God as we are created anew in Christ Jesus unto love. Knowledge, genius, eloquence—all gifts and all attainments are worthless, unless quickened and sanctified by love. "Sounding brass," "tinkling cymbals" are they all. Love is the gauge of even Gospel requirements. Faith has no value, repentance no claim to respect, baptism no meaning, except as they lead us to "the end of the commandments"—love. The exactest orthodox faith is a mockery unless it "works by love." A thousand immersions would not bring us a hair's breadth nearer to God, unless we rise to walk in a new life of love. The most accurate creed may be believed and defended with hot zeal and great fidelity; but if it lead not to love, it is but a hollow pretence. "He that loveth is born of God." "He that loveth dwelleth in God and God in him." "By this we know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brethren." And this is a love "not in word nor in tongue" merely, but "in deed and in truth."

The love of God was shown to us, through Jesus Christ, in the most wonderful self-abnegation. "Though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich." Just as we learn to apprehend and appropriate this love, it constrains us—bears us away with itself—to live not to ourselves. It becomes our very life to bless and save others. The soul enters into the agony of Jesus over a suffering and lost race, and shares his cross-bearing and toil and shame. This we take to be the "first love" which the Ephesian Church had left. The very first impulse of a new-born child of God is to save others.

"Now will I tell to sinners round
What a dear Saviour I have found;
I'll point to thy redeeming blood,
And say, 'Behold the way to God.'"

Where this love is, it will prompt to activity. It can not be at rest. It will seek out objects on which to spend itself. The hungry will be fed, the naked clothed, the sick and the prisoners visited; the broken-heart

will be bound up, the ignorant and the straying will be led to the paths of truth and peace, the homeless will be housed, and sinners that throng the broad road will be warned and instructed. Love will not wait for objects of need to come, but will go out "to seek and to save the lost." It will make channels for itself to flow. There is no neighbourhood—no heart—in this world of sin and suffering, in which it may not leave a blessing. And when it has occupied the field, so far as the sphere of the individual Christian is concerned, it will prompt him to help others in other fields to do a similar work; for love knows no country, no race, no class, no caste—it knows only *man*—lost and suffering *man*—wherever he is to be found. Wisdom may confine love to localities for the sake of effectiveness—beginning at one's home, extending to one's neighborhood, and thence to country, state, or nation; but this is only a question of economy for the time being; for love cannot be selfish or local. It seeks the good of all—the salvation of all.

It is curious to note the developments of this divine principle in the early church. In Jerusalem it led the first converts to sell their possessions and lay the price down at the apostles' feet for the general good. When persecution drove them from their homes, love, triumphant over every other feeling, prompted them to "go everywhere preaching the word." When the churches in Judea suffered with famine, the brethren in other parts made up voluntary contributions and sent to them. Thus, as opportunity demanded, this divine principle revealed itself in every form of benefaction; and its divine charm was its spontaneousness, its cheerfulness, its very eagerness to assert itself. It had not to be coaxed and bribed into activity. It needed no festivals, fairs, balls, and lotteries, to entice or wheedle Christians out of money which otherwise they would not give. God's gifts are voluntary—and the children of God should give like their Father.

We talk much of organization, and labouring toward organized efforts. But there is a greater need than that of co-operation, namely: *individual consecration to God in a service of love*. Without this, no co-operation will succeed. With this, much can be done whether there is co-operation or not; for it will *compel* measures of success. It will not do to lean on organizations. They are good servants, but bad masters. God deals with the individual soul, and holds it responsible. There is no more beautiful method of dispensing good than the quiet, unostentatious, loving ministrations that Christ teaches every individual Christian to engage in; and where love is thus cultivated, it will soon organize itself for larger and more effective work in wider fields.

Where this love exists, churches will not be found to leave the burden of work and pay on the shoulders of a few, while the rest glory in the church as a sleeping carriage—in which they are ticketed through to paradise, and have nothing to do but keep their seats and show their tickets. No: every member will be busy in some department of usefulness, and there will be "effectual working according to the measure of every part," so that there will be "increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

Where this love exists, it will not be difficult to get money when it is needed for any good work. There may be, and there ought to be, caution in ascertaining that the work is a good one and has just claims; but, this once settled, the offering will be voluntary and cheerful.

Christian reader, are you living and walking in love? Are you busy in any work of benevolence for the sake of Christ? Are you lightening the burdens of others—drying mourner's tears—leading the straying to the path of life? Are you devoting some portion of your means for the good

of others? Are you denying yourself, that you may be able to bless others? Or, are you relying on *the church* to do every thing, and basing your hope of acceptance with God on the correctness of your creed and your zeal for ordinances? Is the tone of your life that of "sounding brass," or do you bear in the skirt of your priestly robe "a *golden bell* and a *pomegranate*?"

In view of the great need of a more thorough consecration to God, we could wish that a protracted meeting could be held in every church, the special object of which should be *the growth of the members in love*; the teaching, exhortations, prayers and songs all being on this one point—and conference meetings forming an important part of the programme, in which confession of sin and mutual conference as to the best methods of cultivating and exercising love, should be encouraged. It would not interfere with the conversion of sinners out of the church—it might make saints out of many self-deceived sinners who now burden the church with an unfruitful membership.

I. ERRETT.

MINISTRY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST—No. X.

WIDOW MINISTRY.

"Let not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man, well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work. But the younger widows refuse: for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry; having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith."—1 Tim. v. 9—12.

THE reader will do well carefully to examine the entire chapter from which the above verses are taken. The subject now under notice, of which it mainly treats, is of the deepest interest and importance.

The rendering of the *Common Version* is not all that is desirable. Perhaps that by Dr. Macknight may be accepted as a better translation: "Let not a widow be taken into the number under *sixty* years old, having been the wife of one husband, *borne witness to* for good works; *that she hath brought up children, that she hath lodged strangers, that she hath washed the saints' feet, that she hath relieved the afflicted, that she hath diligently followed every good work.* But the younger widows *reject*: for when they *cannot endure Christ's rein*, they will marry; *incurring condemnation*, because they have *put away their first fidelity*."

Thus, widows of a certain class are represented as entering into an engagement for life, subsequent departure from which involves condemnation; not necessarily eternal condemnation, but at the least such as involves the displeasure, for the time being, of the Church and of God.

What then is that office, work, or number, into which only certain widows are to be admitted, and from which all under sixty years of age are excluded? It cannot refer to church-membership, nor can it apply to the number of those who receive pecuniary aid from the church, for any believing widow, of good conduct, is entitled to membership, and any such one, when in need, is entitled to help without consideration as to age.

The chapter from which the foregoing verses are quoted, by stating certain requirements and prohibitions, and giving certain qualifications, and certain intimations of work to be accomplished and evils to be avoided, places fairly before us the *widow-ministry* of the church of God. Let us note a few particulars in regard to this service, and let the reader say whether the church does not suffer immense loss by allowing this appointment to remain in disuse.

"*The number*," or band, referred to, consists of widows who are "*widows indeed*," or, in other words, *destitute*, not having "children or nephews" (grandchildren) to support them—not of all the widows of this class who enjoy the fellowship of the church, but only of those of "*three score years*" "*well reported of for good works*," who have "*brought up children*," "*lodged strangers*," "*relieved the afflicted*," &c.

Here then is a provision for destitute widows of a given age and character. It is not merely a question of relief, but of work by a duly appointed band—into which band young widows may not be admitted, however great their piety and need, and into which aged widows are not received unless their lives are known to have been such as to make them examples to the flock, in which they undertake to devote the remainder of their days to Christ and incur condemnation if they cast off the obligation.

Preachers and pastors are scarcely, if at all, more necessary than are such mothers in Israel. The younger sisters need them as teachers. We mean, not teaching which finds place in the public assembly, but homely private instruction in those things of every day doing which the young have to learn and the aged to teach. The home of every christian wife and mother should preach to a whole neighbourhood, but in thousands of cases nothing of the sort is realized. If asked what is now needed more than anything else in large churches particularly under my notice, I answer—holy women—experienced consistent sisters—who know the maiden's dangers, the wife's duties, and the widow's trials, and who can aid, by advice and instruction, young and inexperienced females, who have taken upon them the name of the Lord.

Protestants, generally, do not give even a passing thought to this service; Romanists only caricature it. When will the church restore it? What is needful to its restoration? In churches of the primitive order no extraordinary discussion or commotion are to that end called for. It is not so much a matter of resolutions (moved, seconded, and carried), as of quiet growth and easy adoption. Destitute widows of *sixty*, will generally need pecuniary aid from the church. The church cannot make widows, and would not desire so to do. But widows will be found in its membership. Let the church which possesses one or more, duly qualified, undertake to provide plain, comfortable lodging, with what is needful for necessity and comfort (the cost will be little), and let those widows take their proper office and work. There are churches that would gladly do this, but the required women are not in their membership. Widows they have, and widows they help, but the required qualifications are not there, the widows whom it would be a relief and a charity so to support, are not adapted for the work, and would be useless if called into it and, therefore, must not be so called. This is to be regretted. But where is the remedy? It lies chiefly with the female members of the churches, not excepting the young and unmarried. Each should aim to possess all that is required in those who may be, if in the providence of God brought to widowhood and need, set apart to labour so useful and honourable. But those who shall teach when old must learn when young consequently each sister should so study to become wise in the lessons of the scripture, and to obtain what the religion of Jesus requires to be possessed by christian daughters, sisters, wives and mothers, servants or mistresses. So let it be. We shall then have widows in the church fully qualified for this important service.

D. K.

IS A MAN RESPONSIBLE FOR HIS BELIEF?

A short time since I met with an article in which the writer argues that the states of the mind are necessitated; that the mind is wholly passive in believing, and that, consequently, one is not responsible for his belief, for the reason that he could not believe otherwise than he does. And neither God nor man holds one responsible for what he cannot avoid.

Allow me to state wherein I agree, and also wherein I differ from the writer alluded to, and my reasons for both.

Some minds, owing to their yielding, submissive character, receive as truth whatever is presented to them; and owing to their surroundings, they never hear more than one side of a mooted question. Hence they passively receive the impressions made upon them. They assent accordingly. In this they are almost entirely passive. This, the writer referred to, would call faith.

Others are so under the influence of inveterate prejudice, that they have an ear for only one side of a question. Hence, although they may hear, they heed nothing on the other side. They believe what they hear, and "faith comes by hearing."

Others again are so under the influences of worldly interest, that they do not weigh the evidence adverse to their interests. Hence they believe as their interests incline them.

There is another class scrupulously honest with themselves—their own mind, and heart, and conscience. They determine, therefore, to suspend judgment, to hold their decision in abeyance, until they have proved all things. They honestly search for evidence on all sides of the question at issue. They endeavour impartially to weigh all the evidence. They finally decide, it may be, adverse to their former views, feelings and interests. Their assent was yielded in view of all the light they could gather from all sources, allowing, at the same time, full scope for the exercise of conscience. The result in this case also is faith.

In all these cases there is a point reached by the mind, at which it may truthfully be said their faith is necessitated—a point where the mind is passive in the conviction of the thing believed.

To illustrate. A man decides to take his own life. He ascends a mountain, and steps out on the edge of the precipice. He leans over until he loses his balance, and is precipitated to death. Until that balance was lost by his own rash act, his death was not unavoidable; but after that it was necessitated. Another man unwittingly steps beyond the centre of a poised rock on a precipice, it tilts, and he is necessarily killed. But was he necessitated to take the steps that led to his death? Was he forced to toil up the ascent, step by step along the rugged, devious path that led to the poised rock? Not at all. All was voluntary, even the last step to the verge of the precipice; but that led to the fatal result. Having taken that step, the result was unavoidable. In the same way is one's faith necessitated—the mind is passive in believing. But the will is free in the investigation of evidence—the steps that lead to the passive result.

In this view of the subject, it becomes a question of grave importance how far one is responsible for his faith, and the consequent state of conscience because of his involuntary belief.

A late writer says: "In the perception of truth the intelligence is completely passive. Every state of the intelligence is as completely necessitated as is the affirmation that two and two are equal to four. The decisions of the intelligence, then, are not free acts; indeed, they are not acts at all,

in the proper sense of the word. They are passive states of the intelligence." This being admitted, the question arises whether man is responsible for such passive states of his intelligence, and for that state in particular called belief? The same writer says; "With every decision or state of the intelligence, with every perception of truth by it, there is intimately associated an act of the mind, a state of the will, or volition, by which the attention is directed to the subject under consideration; and it is this intimate association in which the two states or mental phenomena are blended into one, which has led so many to regard the passive susceptibility, called the intelligence, as an active power, and its states as free acts of the mind." So then faith is not reason's labour, but repose—the repose of the mind after the mind's labour in examining the facts and weighing the evidence by which they are sustained. The repose is reached only after the mind's labour and toil in the free, and full, and unbiased examination of the whole subject. The conclusion reached without this process could not be a rational faith. The mind is active in the examination of the evidence, but at rest in the conclusion reached. Any other view of the subject is at war with man's freedom of will and consequent responsibility.

Man is possessed of a moral faculty called conscience. It occupies the same place among the moral sentiments that reason does among the intellectual. As the latter decides upon the truth or falsehood of propositions, so does the former upon the moral qualities of actions—whether they are right or wrong. But the decisions of conscience can be depended on only when they are formed under the guidance of enlightened reason, which has to do with propositions and proofs.

But is man responsible for his belief? If not, he cannot be culpable for a wrong belief, nor commendable for a right one. Then there is no good in truth, and no evil in falsehood. This, however, is contrary to universal belief, or knowledge rather. If we, then, reject the conclusion we are forced to abandon the premises, which naturally and necessarily conduct to it.

But if the mind is passive in the state of belief, how, it may be asked, can one be held responsible for it? We answer: Because the mind was actively employed with propositions and evidence, and was possessed of judgment to guide it in its decisions. For this examination and the exercise of this judgment one is responsible, because the mind was free during the process. Man is responsible, not only so far as he has availed himself of the sources of evidence, but to the extent that these sources were within his reach. Indolence, prejudice, or interest will not excuse him for neglecting or refusing to avail himself of all accessible information.

Suppose a man to have been educated in a wrong system of religion; he is nevertheless responsible, because when he arrived at the age of accountability, he should have brought the opinions received by education under an honest examination. The more difficult it is to divest ourselves of prejudices early imbibed, the more necessary is it that, under the influence of a sincere love of truth, we should, with impartiality, diligence, and resolution, seek to find out what is truth.

The objection to holding one responsible for his belief is, that it does not depend upon his will, but results necessarily from the evidence existing before the mind at any given moment. This is true; but we may turn our mind away from the evidence which would have produced a conviction of the truth. Nor is this all. There may be such a state of mind, that

evidence of a certain kind cannot be perceived. But every one ought to divest himself of such a state or temper of mind as produces distorted or erroneous views.

Man has the power of attention—the ability to concentrate his mind upon a given subject. He is responsible for its exercise. He is, moreover, possessed of a will, as free and uncontrolled in its sphere as is the will of God himself in its sphere. The exercise of this will is necessary to the requisite attention to a subject; to a full, fair, impartial, unprejudiced examination of a subject necessary to produce a rational faith. For the proper exercise of this will man is responsible. And if he is held responsible for the means that conduct to the end, he is responsible likewise for the end, namely his belief.

The Scriptures take it for granted that men are accountable for their belief. Hence they are required to believe the truth, and they furnish the evidence, which, if heeded, is adapted to produce conversion. Men are censurable for a wrong belief—the belief of falsehood, and for not believing the truth. Persons are commended and rewarded for their faith in the Christ. All these go to show that men are accountable for their belief.

H.

WHAT IS A CHRISTIAN NATION ?*

WHAT is best for Christianity and for the Church must also be best for the nation. Let us then make two suppositions, both, indeed, imaginary, yet so founded on fact as to be capable of shedding real light on the argument. Suppose on the one hand, a nation in which the principle of an establishment of religion is perfectly carried out, yet where the bulk of the people are irreligious; on the other hand, a nation in which there is no established Church, or legal bond between the Church and the State, yet in which the main body of all classes of the nation are religious. Let it be observed that although in England we have an Established Church, no attempt is made or dreamed of to carry out the principle in its integrity. The bishops are appointed by the Prime Minister, and certain livings are in the gift of the Crown, but the bulk of livings (to use the legal phrase, which always sounds as if an occult irony lurked in it, reminding one rather of sheep-shearing than of sheep-tending) are in private hands, and the right to appoint the ministers of the Church is publicly put up to auction like any other private property. The State asserts no effective control over either the doctrine or the discipline of the Church. The Act of Uniformity is totally powerless to prevent the widest diversities both in teaching and in ritual, and the authority of law, civil and ecclesiastical, is vainly invoked; the schism widens, and the scandal grows from day to day. A very large proportion of the buildings and the clergy of the Established Church have long been maintained entirely on the voluntary principle, and the compulsory rate for maintaining those fabrics which, till recently, the law thus provided for, has now been finally surrendered. Moreover, about half that portion of the nation which attends public worship at all belongs to other Churches unconnected with the State. Now, in place of this anomalous condition of things, suppose every minister appointed by Government, in proportion to population, say one for every 1,500 souls, and paid from taxation or endowments under State control. Suppose a rigid construction and strict enforcement of the compact between the Church and the State as to the doctrines taught and the rites practised.

* From an Essay in "Ecclesia" on Church and State by E. B. Conder, M.A., of Leeds.

Finally, let there be no Dissenters. Yet does not all history show that you might have all this, and that every act of State might be performed in the name of Christianity and blessed by the clergy, and yet the people might be irreligious? The clergy might be moral, benevolent, and conscientious in the fulfilment of their duties, yet the benumbing influence of State officialism might combine with the pride of priestly exclusiveness to cut asunder the golden links of sympathy between them and their people, and rob their ministry of all unction and life. The national homage to religion might be but a stately civility, a stone-cold courtesy. The church-tax might be productive but the churches empty. Christianity might lose its hold on the heart and thought of the nation, and the whole current of the nation's real life flow in channels which it neither guided nor blessed. Now let us be permitted to imagine a nation in which the Church is recognised as a purely spiritual institution. Not a penny is ever paid by the State for the support or encouragement of Christian worship. The office of the Christian ministry neither entitles nor forbids a single citizen to hold a seat in the legislature or any other public office. Each man's *status* in society is determined by his character, abilities, and wealth or calling, irrespective of religious views. Christianity is alike unaided and unhindered.

Then suppose that in every household—or but with rare exceptions—there is daily reading of the Scriptures, and family prayer; that in every school—the State neither enjoining nor prohibiting—the training of conscience and character is regarded as the necessary foundation of education, and every scholar is taught to think of Christ as his Model and his Master. Judges and magistrates, counsel and jurymen, come into court believing that the judgment is the Lord's.

Capitalists acknowledge the supreme claim of Him who says, "the silver is mine, and the gold is mine." Merchants believe that the blessing of the Lord maketh rich; tradesmen, that a just balance is the Lord's; workmen, that what our hand findeth to do, must be done with all our might, as unto the Lord.

On the Lord's day, by common consent, and force of public opinion, every wheel of the vast machine of worldly business rests, and the levity even of innocent amusement is sobered by the presence of a higher joy; and rich and poor meet together in the house of God, to seek his blessing on their earthly life, and to be reminded of the better country. Who does not see, that the former nation, with all its forms Christianised, would be thoroughly unchristian, and that the latter—if such there were—would be in truth a Christian nation, not by force of laws and institutions, but by the free action of Christianity; by the power of the truth and Spirit of Christ on the hearts and homes of its citizens, and thus of necessity on the whole breadth and depth of national life? Imaginary cases, it may be said, prove nothing. If fairly drawn they may prove much, at least negatively; or, if they do not prove, they may teach. The two pictures just sketched prove, at all events, that there is nothing difficult or contradictory in the conception of a Christian nation without any establishment of religion, or of an unchristian nation with an elaborate State Church; and they do but exhibit the complete development of principles and tendencies actually at work. On a small but instructive scale the second picture, or no very faint outline of it, has been realized (though not in any of the so-called great Christian nations) in some of those islands of the Pacific, peopled a generation ago with naked, idolatrous cannibals, where—with religious avoidance of the establishment principle—Christianity has been

the parent of civilisation and literature, and the nurse of law, freedom and commerce. On the other hand, the working of the establishment principle, both in our rough inconsistent English fashion, and in those countries in which it has been tried more systematically, has been such as to warrant the conclusion, that the more completely it is worked, the more complete is its failure in regard to the real Christianisation of the national life. . . . If the promise is to be fulfilled, that all nations are to be blessed in Christ; and that not believing souls merely but nations are to become his inheritance; it surely follows that He must hold in his hand the remedy for these two grand hindrances to the development of national life. He must be able to furnish the central authority to which all nations will bow, thenceforth laying aside their selfish, foolish impious strife, and learning to seek, not every land its own, but every land the welfare of others: "neither shall they learn war any more."

He must be no less able to furnish the missing principle, the regulating law, for the internal law of each commonwealth; so that its legislation, and the growth and permanence of its constitution, shall thenceforth be settled, not by the strife of class with class by party tactics, personal following, and the uncontrollable force of circumstances; but by the intelligent brotherly co-operation of each with all. Now, let any one, able to comprehend and weigh these considerations, gravely ask himself whether any form of union between Church and State—in other words, any union of the organisation in which men combine as Christians for spiritual purposes with the organisation in which men combine as citizens for civil purposes—can possibly have the slightest power to heal these rooted evils, or bring about these blessed results, national and international. Divesting our minds of all unmeaning verbiage and misleading sentiment, and also assuming that even the advocates of a State-Church renounce the right and duty of persecution, what do we really mean by the establishment of religion, but simply these two things, money (including money's worth, as lands and buildings), and a certain position and *prestige* for the clergy—whether of one church or sect, or of all? A dead machinery, which according as it is worked, may do much, or little, or nothing, to promote true religion, or may even become an engine for repressing it, and a social leverage, dangerous to its possessors, and as capable of being used for mischief as for good. What can these things do, or what have they ever done, to make a nation really a Christian people, so that its foreign policy, legislation, administration, public opinion, business, amusements, education, production and expenditure of wealth, should all be supremely guided by the word of Christ, and ruled by His will? If a State-Church be, indeed, God's chosen means for thus blessing, ennobling, and sanctifying the national life, let us have not an incongruous, fragmentary system, in which antiquated inefficiency is eked out with the earnestness of voluntary effort; and huge masses of population are untouched with even that faint varnish of outward Christianity which would make them put on Sunday clothes and come to church once a Sunday; but give us a real complete thorough-going establishment; paying the worker for his work, and taking care that he does it; paying no one a sixpence who has no real work to do; and leaving no part of the work undone, but bringing home the Gospel to every door in England. If no one wants this, or dreams of it, and men are only quarrelling about money and social position, then, in the name of all truth and honesty, let us cease to profane sacred words, and try to name things truly, and look facts in the face. A nation can become truly Christian in no other way than by being composed of real Christians, if

not exclusively, yet in such proportion that the whole tone and course of its national life and manners shall be Christian. No action of Government can effect this; no institutions, votes of majorities, endowment of clergy, or of schoolmasters; nothing but the enlightened faith and free obedience of individual minds and consciences. If truth free cannot do it, still less will truth fettered. If a ministry who live by the Gospel, because they preach the Gospel, cannot do it, still less can a ministry who live by their office, whether they preach the Gospel or not.

FAITH AND LOVE.

Each of these terms, in its fullest sense, is made to embrace the whole idea of man's duty. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life," says the Saviour. John iii. 36. This evidently exhausts the whole matter, for to have everlasting life is to be possessed of that rest that remains for the people of God. By cramping and distorting this passage a prop is obtained for both the "faith alone" doctrine and "final perseverance" doctrine. But who supposes the Saviour meant the act of faith alone without obedience? He never recognized an individual as a believer in Him, who did not obey Him. "You are my friends if you do whatsoever I command you." "If you love me, keep my commandments," said He.

Faith in its completeness embraces all that we do to become free from sin, and all that must be done to inherit eternal life. So with love; it is said to be the fulfilling of the law. John says we know we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. But again this is not love in the abstract, nor indeed can I conceive an abstract principle in the Christian religion. Whenever it is abstracted it becomes lifeless, just as faith without works is dead, being alone. We are justified by no single item of duty, only as it is connected with all the others. After we have taken all the steps that bring us into Christ, we may look back and say we were justified at each step, but in commencing, we cannot say we are justified at any step, without taking all that follow in order. Our Lord requires a test of our faith and love; nor is a declaration of our feelings a sufficient test, but a willing obedience to *all* his commands.

We may cheat ourselves into the feeling that we believe in the Christ, when we at the same time find ourselves unwilling to do what he has commanded us to do. We may, indeed, carry this deception in our hearts to such an extent that we will profess faith in the Messiah, when we are questioning the essentiality of a positive command. And in the matter of love, we are almost certain to be deceived if we trust to our feelings.

We all, perhaps, feel that we love the brethren, but we may err, in the first place, in our contracted views of who the brethren are, and again we are most apt to err in our ideas of what it is to love the brethren. Hear John again: "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments." But how may we know that we love God? "For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments."

Let us not be deceived, for we neither love God nor our brother when we neglect our duty to either. May the God of love help us.—A. CLARK.

GOD IN PROVIDENCE.

We often speak of mysterious providence, when affliction comes upon us, as if it were mysterious that God should do as he has promised to do, and as he has always done to his people. We walk like the bereaved men of Emmaus, and are sad. We think: Why was I singled out for such sorrow? Why have others been spared such trials, whilst I have been called to endure them? Life thus becomes to us a pathway of sorrow, and we walk and are sad. Then could our eyes be opened, we would see beside us one who walks unseen by eyes so dimmed with tears, and his words to us might be, "O slow of heart to believe all that is written in Moses and the prophets concerning me and concerning you. Ought not Christ's people to suffer such things and then to enter into glory? If the captain of our salvation was made perfect through sufferings, must not you attain perfection by the same path?" Thus as we begin with the sufferings of Abel, and come down through the long cloud of witnesses, until we reach the "great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, kindred and people, and tongues" who have come out of great tribulation, and washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb, we shall feel our hearts begin to burn within us, and be ready to say not only "the Lord's will be done," but even "I glory in tribulation, knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope," and that hope will not make us ashamed. Then if the day grows dark to us, and shadows of sorrow or of death begin to fall, let us beseech the Master to "abide with us," and soon we shall arise and go, not to the little company in the earthly Jerusalem, but to the innumerable company that is found in the heavenly Jerusalem, where there is no night forever.

T. V. MOORE.

THE WONDERFUL TRANSFORMATION.

EXCLUSIVE of animal decay, we can hardly arrive at a more absolute type of impurity than the mud or slime of a damp, overtrodden path in the outskirts of a manufacturing town. That slime we shall find, in most cases, composed of clay (or brick-dust, which is burnt clay), mixed with soot, a little sand and water. All these elements are at helpless war with each other, and destroy, reciprocally, each other's nature and power—competing and fighting for place at every tread of your foot—sand squeezing out clay, and clay squeezing out water, and soot meddling everywhere and defiling the whole. Let us suppose that this ounce of mud is kept in perfect rest, and that its elements gather together like to like, so that their atoms get into the closest relations possible. Let the clay begin. Ridding itself of all foreign substances, it gradually becomes a white earth, already very beautiful, made into finest porcelain, and painted on, and to be kept in king's palaces. But such artificial consistence is not its best. Leave it still quiet, to follow its own instinct of unity; it becomes not only white, but clear; not only clear, but hard; but so *set* that it can deal on the light in a wonderful way, and gather out of it the loveliest blue rays only, repressing the rest. We call it then a *sapphire*. Such being the consummation of the clay, we then give similar permission of quiet to the sand. It also becomes first a white earth; then it grows clear and hard, and at last arranges itself in mysterious and infinitely fine parallel lines, which have the power of reflecting not merely the blue rays, but the blue, green, purple and red rays, in the greatest beauty in which they can be seen through any hard material whatever. We call it then *opal*.

In next order, the soot sets to work. It cannot make itself white at first—but, instead of being discouraged, tries harder and harder, and at last comes out clear, the hardest thing in the world; and for the blackness it had, obtains in exchange the power of reflecting all the rays of the sun at once, in the most vivid blaze that any solid thing can emit. We call it then a *diamond*. Last of all the water purifies or wastes itself, contented enough if it only reaches the formation of a dew-drop. But if we persist in its proceeding to a more perfect consistence, it crystallizes into the shape of a star. So, for the ounce of slime we had at first, we have a sapphire, an opal, and a diamond set in the midst of a star of snow. We see, then, the seeming trouble—the degradations of the elements of earth must passively wait the appointed time of their restoration. But if there be in us a nobler life than in those strangely moving atoms—if, indeed, there is an eternal difference between the *fire* which inhabits them and that which animates us, it must be shown by each of us in his appointed place—not merely in the pretence, but in the activity of our hope; not merely by our desire, but by our labour for the time when the dust of the generations of men shall be conformed for foundations of the gates of the city of God.

RUSKIN.

THE CHARIOT OF GOD.

DARKNESS came down at noon-day which made the nations wonder;
Flame from disparting clouds, with spirit-shaking thunder.
Now burning towns are lurid red against the midnight sky,
And there is interchange of storm from earth to heaven on high.
The fields of life are trodden by hosts who cannot remain at home;
The river's choked by ghastly dead, and crested by purple foam.
Faces so wan or desperate—voices so wild or hoarse!
But still God's Chariot drives on, and none may stay its course.

The earthquake rocks the world, and the mystic fathomless ocean
Breaks forth in her pride and her power to swell the grand commotion.
From slippery pools of blood, and piles of unconfined dead
Pestilence taints the air—and the birds of song are fled.
Forests are wrapped in fire, and from the scorching breath,
The naked peasants flee, and Ruin calls upon Death.
Verily the storm is loose and hell has potent force;
But still God's Chariot drives on, and none may stay its course.

The shout of bannered hosts on fields of terrible slaughter,
And the cry of surging mobs is all—for living water!
But they shout from rending earth to an iron sky,
And drink from the poisoned fountains always nigh.
The glorious things of life are hidden behind the veil;
Purity languishes sore, while truth and freedom fail.
The revel is still prolonged—the tyrant has no remorse,
But still God's Chariot rolls on, and none may stay its course.

Can science not provide a charmed and holy mountain?
And has philosophy no secret living fountain
In the midst of darkened heavens and this crimson flood!
Where are the golden chains of deep true brotherhood?
Have the sages spoken lies—is the boasted age of gold
But barbarism gilded? And are we shamefully sold
Into fools' paradise by visionary discourse?
Still the Chariot of God drives on, and none may stay its course.

Once more, and yet once more, above artillery's rattle,
Above all the tempest and agonies of battle!
The Republic is called! and the name is still a power
Whenever the clock of destiny strikes the given hour!
The parched nations drink so free the heaven descended wine
The old passions riot quick—the old faces shine!
The marriage is so glorious!—But what of the divorce?
Still the Chariot of God drives on, and none may stay its course.

Let the clarion loudly peal, and each rejoicing nation
Glow and bask in the confines of the new civilization!
But if culture is but varnish and man needs regenerate life,
How long? till the furies break forth in olden strife
Vain is the soap and nitre for the Ethiopian skin,
While the blood which discolours runs in such force within.
How shall we reach the fountain head and source?
Still the Chariot of God drives on, and none may stay its course.

Is there no better watch-word, no spell more glorious?
No formula of power more solemn and victorious?
Many of the Empire or Republic would sing,
But who speaks a word about bringing back the king?
Yet there lies the fountain—the source of the sublime!
The cure for all the maladies of mortality and time!
O! king of glory, come in divinest force
And let God's Chariot drive on with none to stay its course. G. G.

WATCH AND PRAY.

"WATCH and pray!"—Awake, O sleeper!
Hosts of evil rage around;
In the strife thy Lord and Keeper,
Sunk in anguish to the ground.

"Watch and pray!"—For, watching, praying,
Toiling through that night of woe,
Comes a voice, so earnest, saying—
"Watch ye, as ye dread the foe."

"Watch and pray!"—For human weakness
Needs the safeguard every hour,
Since the Mighty One in meekness
Prayed against the tempter's power.

"Watch and pray!"—With deep concernment
Stands the heart that braved the foe;
Heart that probed with keen discernment
All the depths of sin and woe.

"Watch and pray!"—For He would save thee:
Cleave to Him with purpose clear.
From the sin that would enslave thee
Stand aloof in holy fear.

G. Y. T.

Reviews, Notes, Passing Events, &c.

BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY GHOST AND FIRE.—A Sermon by O. A. CARR, B.A., Melbourne.

A PLAIN and useful statement of New Testament teaching upon a much misunderstood subject. John the Baptist is introduced thus:—

"While Jesus was at Nazareth, there came John the Baptist—a simple child of nature, clothed in camel's hair, with a leathern girdle about his loins, relying solely upon the *divinity* of his mission for his *acceptance* with the people; and, with an austere, authoritative manner suited to his rough work of preparing the way of the Lord and making His paths straight, he raised his voice in the wilderness of Judea, to encounter *directly* the prejudice and sins of the people, and commanded them to '*Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.*' Matt. iii. 2. A strange dress he wore! Was there any reason why he should be so clad? Yes! He *practised* what he preached. He preached the '*Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.*' Mark i. 4. 'Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins.' Matt. iii. 5—6. We see the propriety in his durable suit of camel's hair, for he baptized the people *in* Jordan; and he must have gone *into* the river to baptize in it. Moreover, when Jesus was baptized of John, He straightway *came up* out of the water. [The word here rendered '*came up*'—*anebee*—is composed of *ana* and *baino* *Ana* means throughout, and is the preposition the Greeks used in speaking of the height of anything—so many feet from bottom to top (*ana*). Its literal meaning is, up throughout from bottom to top. Hence the true rendering of the passage is, Jesus came up throughout (*anebee*) from (*apo*) the water]. Jesus must have been *in* the water, or he could not have come out of it. He went down *into* the water, was put under it (buried) when baptized, and then came up throughout from the water." Matt. iii. 16.

On the baptism *with* (or rather *in*) fire, we have the following:—

"It has been argued that the baptism in fire simply denotes the purification of the heart as the effect of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. If this be true, there would be really no baptism in fire, but only an *effect* of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Then John should have said, 'He (Jesus)

shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit, and that will have the effect of purifying your hearts like fire purifies.' You see such interpretation would do away with the baptism in fire altogether, and would nullify the word of God. Hence, we cannot receive it. If baptism take place in fire at all, there *must* be *fire* (not something *like* fire—not an *effect* like that which fire produces, but fire itself), or there would be no baptism in *fire*. Then, since the change of the element does not change the act (baptism)—does not, cannot, make it figurative—we believe John's words concerning Jesus, viz.:—'He shall baptize you *in* the Holy Spirit and fire' to be strictly literal.

You observe that this was a prophecy concerning Jesus which was not at that time fulfilled. We have now to show its fulfilment. Since the Holy Spirit and fire are both mentioned as distinct elements, it is evident that it is a double prophecy, teaching that Jesus was to perform two baptisms—one in the Holy Spirit and one in fire. The meaning of the baptism in fire is clearly set forth in the 12th verse, 'Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and he will gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.' Then, since Jesus never baptized any one in fire while on earth,—and since He has not yet used His fan to separate the chaff from the wheat, *i.e.*, the wicked from the righteous,—and since the Saviour taught that the righteous and wicked live together (the wheat with the tares) till the harvest (the judgment),—and since, at the judgment, the Saviour is to separate the chaff and wheat, and gather the wheat into the garner,—and since the chaff is to be burned up with unquenchable fire *after* the separation,—we, therefore, conclude that the 'baptism in fire' is a prophecy as yet unfulfilled, and that it refers to the casting the wicked into hell after the judgment. This is very fitly called a baptism; and it helps us to understand what baptism is. The Saviour will not sprinkle or pour a little fire on the heads of the wicked, but will 'cast them into the lake of fire.' Rev. xx. 14. That will be immersion beyond a doubt, and it is called baptism: hence, baptism in fire is *immersion* in fire. In further proof that the baptism in fire will take place after the judgment, we notice the fact that in the only two places where the baptism in fire is mentioned, viz.:—Matt. iii. 12, Luke iii. 16, the

phrase, 'Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire,' immediately follows as explanatory; but in Mark i. 8, where there is a part of the prophecy under consideration, but *no mention of baptism in fire*, this explanatory phrase is omitted. Also, when the Saviour and Peter use the prophecy of John about the baptism in the Holy Spirit—Acts i. 5, and xi. 16 (which occurred on the Day of Pentecost) they make no allusion to the baptism in fire, and hence do not introduce the explanatory sentence about burning up the chaff, &c. Matt. iii. 12. This clearly shows that the baptism in the Holy Spirit and the baptism in fire are not associated, and that the baptism in fire is not an effect of baptism in the Holy Spirit; but that the baptism in fire means the casting the wicked into hell *after* the judgment, while the baptism in the Holy Spirit took place on the Day of Pentecost—Acts i. 5, ii. 1—4, and at the house of Cornelius"—Acts x. 44, xi. 15—16.

On the baptism in the Spirit, we read:—

"Jesus also contrasts His work with John's. *Only* Jesus baptized in the Holy Spirit: John baptized in *water*. Since Jesus had taught His *Apostles* that they should be baptized in the Holy Spirit when they received it,—and since we know they received it on the Day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 4)—*there* (at Jerusalem) and *then* (Day of Pentecost) we must find the baptism in the Holy Spirit. We have only to notice the Pentecostean transactions to understand the subject. They were these:—

1. The Holy Spirit was poured out from God. Acts ii. 17.

2. A sound filled the house where they were assembled. Acts ii. 2.

3. Cloven tongues *like* as of fire rested on each of the Apostles. Verse 3.

4. *They* (Apostles) were all filled with the Holy Spirit. Verse 4.

Now, to which of these transactions does the word baptism refer? Not to the pouring out of the Holy Spirit, surely! because the word for pour (*cheoo*) is never used to designate baptism. Moreover, if pouring be baptism, then the thing poured must be the thing baptized; but the *Spirit* was poured, and the *Apostles* were baptized. Hence, the pouring out of the Spirit was not the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Neither was the coming of the sound which filled the room a baptism in the Holy Spirit. If that was a baptism, it was in *sound*, not in the *Holy Spirit*; and it is very evident that the Apostles were not baptized in cloven tongues. Hence, the word baptism must refer to the only other thing that occurred, viz.:—"They were all *filled* with

the Holy Spirit,' for which the pouring out of the Spirit was a preparation. Their spirits in their bodies were certainly baptized (immersed) in the Holy Spirit when their bodies were *filled* with the Holy Spirit.

This we claim to be the only possible meaning of the passage; for when the baptism in the Holy Spirit is spoken of, the *spirit* of man, *not* his *body*, is the subject of baptism, the pouring out of the Spirit from God being preparatory to its filling the man.

The *spirits* of the Apostles were baptized in the Holy Spirit. John baptized the *bodies* of the people in water. Jesus never baptized any *body* in water, and none but Jesus ever baptized the spirits of men in the Holy Spirit. Whom, then, did Jesus baptize in the Holy Spirit? We have already shown that He thus baptized the Twelve Apostles (the rest of the 120 excluded). He gave the promise to the Twelve *only*—Acts i. 2—4; and the Twelve *only* received the promise—"They (which can refer to none but the *Twelve*—Acts i. 26, and ii. 1—4) were all filled with the Holy Spirit"—their spirits baptized in the Holy Spirit. Peter informs us that Cornelius and his friends received the Holy Spirit as he and the other Apostles did at the beginning (Day of Pentecost); and we have already shown that the Apostles were baptized in the Holy Spirit. Hence, we claim, that Cornelius and his friends were baptized in the Holy Spirit. The antecedents and consequents were the same in the two cases. Cornelius and his friends spoke in tongues, and magnified God, just as the Apostles 'spoke in other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance,' and the Holy Spirit was given in each of these cases *without* human agency. Hence, these two differ from all other cases of the miraculous endowments of the Holy Spirit recorded in the New Testament. In other instances (such as are described in Acts viii. 18, and xix. 6) the Apostles laid their hands on the heads of the people, and prayed, and imparted the Holy Spirit. The latter, then, were not baptisms *in* but an impartation of the Holy Spirit through the agency of the Apostles."

In concluding, the author says:—

"Some good people pray God to 'baptize them *with* the Holy Ghost and with fire.' We never hear such prayers without being shocked; for in the only two passages in the Bible where the baptism in fire is mentioned, it is explained thus:—"He (Jesus) will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.' Surely, they don't mean to pray that they may be the chaff, and be baptized in the lake of fire! May God keep us from such baptism! And those who pray to be '*baptized with* the Holy

Ghost' pray for what Jesus never taught them to pray, and for what He never promised to give them. But Jesus did teach His disciples to pray for the Holy Spirit, and promised to give it to them. Every Christian does have the Holy Spirit dwelling in him—his body is a temple of the Holy Spirit; and his prayer should be for more of the Holy Spirit that he may be more like Jesus."

Substantially we agree in this closing quotation, but think the language hardly accurate. We do not see that the Christian should pray for the Holy Spirit. True, the disciples were taught thus to pray; but then the promised gift and baptism had not taken place. But when the Spirit has been given,—has taken up his abode in the church, has made the church the temple of

God—we see no more need to pray for the Holy Spirit than to pray for the presence of a friend who is already seated by our side. As a living stone, in the temple in which the Spirit dwells, the Christian has the privilege of communion with the Spirit. This he has always. The Spirit is always at home in the temple—never leaves it—and, therefore, we pray not for the Spirit to come, nor for his presence. But our communion with the Spirit is a thing of degree, depending upon our state and receptivity, and, therefore, we may well pray for closer communion, and consequent larger help from the ever-present Spirit of God.

THE DURATION AND NATURE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

By H. CONSTABLE.—*Longman, London.*

THIS is one of many pamphlets published upon a theme everywhere under notice. It is a clear statement of the argument generally presented by those who understand the punishment of the wicked to be *eternal*, that it does not consist in torment by fire, but in the second death, or endless destruction. It is not our intention to adduce any portion of the argument as it relates to this, the main feature of the work; but there are suggestions in relation to the preservative influence of the final punishment of the wicked upon other races and orders of beings, which are worthy of note. On this head we present an interesting quotation:—

"We must keep in mind the *great object of punishment*. With a just ruler this object is never pain inflicted in a spirit of hatred, or pain greater than the offence deserves. With a just ruler *retribution*, no doubt, is an end, but it is the least end of punishment. His great end is *prevention*. In the punishment of offenders he always has more regard to the law keepers than to the law breakers. Protection to the former in their lawful callings; warning to them against the imitation of crime—these are the great ends

aimed at by wise and just rulers in punishment of actual crime. Regard to these will be the great ruling motive in the regulation of punishment. Regard to these will operate *most powerfully* on the treatment of the criminal. At one time it will demand a sternness in punishment all but productive of actual injustice to the individual punished. Regard for society may, in another aspect, mitigate to a most serious extent the punishment justly due to his crime. But regard to society in all its branches and all its interests is the grand aim in all wise human legislation on crime; and that legislator has shown the highest wisdom who, while never transgressing the limits of justice, has so arranged his penal code that it has had the greatest effect possible in protecting the law-respecting community in their minutest rights, and providing that they shall never degenerate into the condition of the law-breaking classes. All severity, short of injustice, is not only wise, but is *most merciful*, that has this effect.

Now it is in this light that we are to view future punishment, together with that long permission of evil, with all its attendant circumstances, its glitter, its pleasures, its supposed advantages, its delusiveness, its pains, which we have seen in the history of our own race as well as in our partial glimpses into the history of a higher, and which will doubtless in all their real bearing

remain on eternal record in the annals of God's great world. To say that what we call the fall of angels was the first appearance of moral evil, is to say what cannot be affirmed. All that we can say with certainty is that it was the beginning of that outburst of moral evil with which we are connected, and in which, as regards us, the redemption of Christ has interposed. Our opinion is that the outburst of evil which began with the angelic fall, and spread on to the fall of man, is positively the first appearance of moral evil in the universe of God. But we cannot here dogmatize. What we are much more strongly persuaded of is that if not the first it will be the last. We know from Scripture that this outburst will be obliterated and become extinct. We think we see, with almost equal certainty, that evil will break out no more.

But God, in dealing with the higher order of His creatures, is dealing, not with lifeless matter, not with living things walking by a law of necessity, but with living creatures under the high and elevating but also *most perilous condition of a free will*; free to choose the good, and to rise on the wings of goodness to God its source, and to enjoy the immortality of God; as free to choose the evil, and to sink beneath its weight to depths of utter darkness. Nor is this an imaginary evil, a theoretical possibility, to be discussed as a school problem, but never to be met with as a reality. Angels—we know not how many, but we know that they are many—who once walked in holiness, used their free will to range themselves in opposition to God. Man, a weaker and a lower creature, yet inexperienced and unsuspecting, also uses his free will to depart from God. And so, in these various ways, in these various shades of original guilt, sin entered into God's universe, and produced evil effects, of which we know something from what we daily hear and see, but whose full consequences are known only to God.

But this is not all. There is the very same possibility and danger of further fall that there ever was. It may be that the angelic world of past creation are so fortified and strengthened by what they have already seen of the evils of sin, that with them there is no moral possibility of further fall. But we have no reason for supposing that among the spheres are no creatures such as we. Nor have we the smallest reason for supposing that God has come to the limit of His creative energy and will. He is not the inactive god of an Epicurean philosophy, reposing in dreary self-satisfied contemplation. He is a God who delights to be at work, and the spirit He breathes into all is a love of work. Look at the earth: it affords innumerable evidences of His busy hand and brain.

Look at the stars: doubtless they show the same ceaseless energy of God. But we know that He is not content with the creation only of the lower organizations. He delights to form creatures that know with a conscious love their Maker, and in this knowledge rise higher and higher, nearer and yet more near to their source. Who can place limits to the future expansion of our race when the consummation has come? Who can say with any faint shadow of probability that God will close His creation with man? Even while we write or while we read there may be reproducing in some distant planet, whose geological changes have come to their required perfection, the *fac-simile* of the scene in Eden six thousand years ago. Or who can say that it may not be ours as the ages of our blessed future roll on—our own days of marrying and giving in marriage existing only in the memory—to see what angels saw here once, a figure of noble front and faultless form rising from the earth in the majesty of perfect manhood, and God placing in his thrilling grasp the hand of woman, as lovely in face as she is innocent in mind, and saying in words that should cover with shame all who derogate from God's holy ordinance of marriage, 'Increase and multiply, and replenish the world that I have given you.'

But these are races made under free will. It may be that some of them in their beginning are no higher than we were in ours. Eve does not seem to have been before the fall much wiser than she was after it. A woman without guile, without suspicion, without experience, loving, curious, credulous. Do you reject the picture? It is not ours: it is what we see on the canvass of Scripture. Adam was apparently in much resembling many of his sons: ardent, hasty, impetuous; at a beautiful woman's solicitation he threw away, with open eyes, duty and loyalty; without her he will not live—with her he will die. And what were the consequences? We read them:—outside Eden, in the deluge at Sodom, in Potiphar's house, in the wars of Canaan, on the hill of Calvary, at the siege of Jerusalem, in the shouts of the Goths and Vandals, in the Crusaders' wars, in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, in the snows of Russia, in the glittering scenes of heartless vanity, in the morbid passions and stunted affections of conventual imprisonment, in the gambling tables of Baden, in the lust markets of Paris and of London; we read them in our world's history of crime, and sin, and sorrow, and death.

Now the divine code of punishment, from the expulsion from Eden and the growth of the thistle down to the closing punishment of hell, has regard to the various, complicated, and universal interests of the higher

creation, wherever it may now or will hereafter exist. It is not solely, we say it is not chiefly, for those to whom it shall be said 'Depart into everlasting fire.' We are by no means prepared to say that if fallen man, aye, and even fallen angels, had alone been in question, their treatment by God might not have been widely different. Had they alone been in question we dare not confine the efforts of their recovery to those which have been actually made. Christ might in that case have taken hold of angels, instead of putting forth redemption only for the sons of Abraham. Man's day of grace might not in that case have been confined to his life here, from the cradle to the grave, but grace might have followed him on, from age to age and world to world, ere it would cease to strive to win back those who had once offered to God the pure incense of a creature's praise, who had once felt the ennobling emotions of the heart's love and worship of God.

So it has not been. Angels fell! No saving hand was stretched from the Throne to raise them up; no Son of God went forth to war for them. Man fell! The Son rose up from the place of honour, and said to His Father, 'Here am I, send me;' and He laid aside His majesty, and He emptied Himself, and He became a man, and for man He bore shame and rejection, and the death upon the cross. 'Not in vain sounds forth the voice of grateful love which has been growing and swelling from the small voice outside the gates of Eden to the voice of many waters within the gates of the New Jerusalem. But how many left behind! How many voices silent! How many pulsations of life stilled for evermore.

Now what we say is this: Doubtless with a merciful view to others—to others, perhaps, as far exceeding the number of the lost as the sands of all old ocean's shores exceed those of its smallest strand—has the punishment of the various classes consigned at the judgment to hell been decreed. In that of angels will be seen *the danger of one irrevocable step*, where no hand was put forth to save, where, perhaps, no wish was ever felt to return. As regards men, some in all ages, even the darkest, were saved from the effects of a step which, in their case, was not irrevocable.

And may we not even here see mercy beaming forth? In all judgments we believe that God remembers mercy, and that mercy is kept full in mind in the judgment on fallen angels and reprobate men of every shade of guilt. God's higher order of creation have all to walk along the perilous course of free will in order to attain each the end of their being. There are rocks, shoals, quicksands by the way. Each rock has witnessed the wreck of some

gallant ship; each shoal is strewn with fragments; each quicksand has swallowed up brave beating hearts. But straightway has risen up the beacon on the headland, the lighthouse on the reef, the deep-toned bell floating over the sands, and sending its solemn warning across the treacherous waves; and fleets traverse in safety where now one and now another noble vessel has been dashed in pieces and gone down. We feel satisfied that we are not drawing on imagination for what we say. We know that in the path which race after race has to tread there is danger of falling. We know that, called to go up higher, even to the top of God's mount, they may fall headlong. We are satisfied that the divine jurisprudence regards the welfare of the great numbers as its paramount consideration. We see the important bearing of future punishment as it is revealed in Scripture, severe, but never unjust, on this widely-stretching interest of unbounded space, of eternal duration. We see how every shade of severity tells on some vast destiny of the future, from the severity which punishes where the hands had been vainly stretched out all the day long, and the pleading voice had been mocked at, to the severity which punishes where no clear voice had spoken, and where, if such a voice had ever spoken it would have been heard. To none, no, not the least guilty, is wrong done when God withdraws from the dim child of savage nature, or as the dim child of the dark circles which lie within the surroundings of our most vaunted civilization, the life He withdraws from the angel above him; from the beast scarce below him. But to numbers without number may this act, to us bordering upon injustice, but never entering one hair's-breadth within its domain, be an act of supremest mercy, love, and wisdom; for surely that conduct of God is most wise, most loving, most merciful, which, through a severity which the lost have ceased to feel, has made to countless others the ennobling path of free will to be as safe as to the lower creatures is their ignoble path of necessity.

It may be a part of our office in the coming age to point the moral of the marvellous parable to ears that hear it with more benefit than Adam listened to the tale brought from heaven by Raphael. We can then follow out to its close what the angel could only begin. We can then intertwine with the history of the higher race the fortunes of the lower, and carry on both to their common termination. We can tell of a race that in its fall had no redemption. We can tell of a redemption that visited another fallen race; of its miracles of grace; of its final victory; but also of its utter failure to save in unnumbered instances. We can tell them that

not only obstinate guilt has its danger, but negligence, inexperience, ignorance, descending as an inheritance from generation to generation. And all this is told to races rejoicing in the first flush of that life which beats tumultuously in the new created. If the sinner's ruin is their safety, and his destruction their safeguard against loss, then even the sinner's ruin was not in vain—even his devious footsteps have not been aimless; and we can find a great and precious truth in a Scripture at which we are sometimes inclined to stumble: that 'The Lord hath made all things for Himself, yea, even the wicked for the day of evil.' The great stumbling block, the existence of evil, will be a stumbling block no more. Evil is seen to exist, not, with Augustine, to be perpetuated for ever, but to be, under the providence of the great Sovereign and loving Father, *its own eternal destruction*.

And this conclusion of the matter will exhibit to us *the limits of that free will* into whose bounds we have ventured with hesitating step to enter. . . . *The free creature can defeat Divine goodness for itself, but no further.* His own good he may refuse, his own evil he may choose, and yet there may be designs in the great scheme of Divine providence which in so doing he has unconsciously or unwillingly worked out. Such we know to be the case here. 'God maketh the wrath of man' his sin, its end, 'to praise Him.' The sinner has, no doubt, defeated God's goodness for himself, thrust back the proffered hand that was full of blessing, like the sullen child retired into the darkness from the cheerful room where the fire blazed brightly, and brothers and sisters played and laughed—but he saw not a good glorious end which God brought about by his very conduct. Other worlds behold us; other worlds hear of us. There is a universal history of creation with which the history of each part is inseparably linked. Earth's drama—its gladness and its sadness, its sin and its holiness, its life and its death, its redemption embraced and rejected—is not an unconnected episode of a great poem, but is a mighty transaction of time, in which all worlds and all beings

take a share—God, and angels, and men—and which is to bear with a mighty bearing upon the ages of the future. So it is represented in Scripture. The puny sceptic, blear-eyed and short-sighted, may sneer at the thought of the trouble which our world is said to have occasioned in the councils of heaven; not so they who stand near the throne. Angels desire to look into these things: the conversion of a sinner is joy throughout their ranks. Here in this remote sphere things are doing and will be done which will tell on intelligences whose names and abodes will never reach our knowledge here. That fall of angels and men which free will made possible—that death among angels and men which the power of choice effected—may, working only by moral means, make in the glorious realm of freedom another fall and another death *morally impossible*. The loss of life to some, possible from their place in creation, just in the dealings of God's jurisprudence, may be pure unmitigated mercy to the greater number. The permission of evil—of evil leading to one sad result in death—may issue in another result: *the eternal and undisturbed establishment of good*.

Now unquestionably the foregoing assumes the *final* extinction of every wicked being, so that in the whole universe of God evil and suffering shall not be known. But the reader will perceive that, whether in that particular he think with the author or not, the utility of future punishment, to countless worlds and through all eternity, is equally apparent. Even if some suffer for ever, in that least degree of suffering which the love of God can award them, it will still be for the benefit of the vaster multitudes, and, therefore, compatible with that principle of jurisprudence which secures the greatest good to the greatest number.

THE SPHINX AND BRADLAUGH.

"*The Sphinx*," a Manchester paper, has been on a visit to the Secularists, and reports the result by giving a picture of Mr. Bradlaugh. Taking the outline altogether it might have been much wider the mark than it is. Behold the picture then:—

"I have heard an eloquent young lady,

in whose sermons there is charm and freshness and enthusiasm enough to fill the Free Trade Hall with listeners, maintain with a thorough woman's question-begging argument that there was no one who in his heart was an infidel—that is, Atheist. This may have been one of those swift intuitions which in women compensate for incapacity of reasoning. But I am bound to say that the earnestness of Mr. Bradlaugh

was withering, and the enthusiasm of his supporters had all the fire of genuineness. I even took away the impression that they were more than mere infidels; that they were fanatics in Atheism and bigots in unbelief. But not all. Many seem to have come hoping for an entertainment of defiant audacity, just as they might pay to see a murderer in wax, an abortion, or a giant. There was a touch of the stage-manager's art in the dressing of the platform. The lecturer was supported by a water-bottle, and flanked by a table with two severe chairmen thrown out as wings. This ostentatious simplicity had a singular but light background of young ladies, ranged in a single row along the wall at the back, who sat solemn and quiet as any Quakeresses.

In *King Richard III.*, Shakespere has drawn a lurid picture of keen, fierce, sensitive intellectuality, burning through and triumphing over repulsiveness of aspect, deformity of person, and inferiority of position, which, however, have warped it to bitterness and malignancy, and turned it into the channel of a cruel and hungry ambition. Mr. Bradlaugh has no graces of person, no advantages of a pleasing voice or charm of manner. But the fierce force of his will, the swift passionate rush of his oratory, burnt through and triumphed over the aspect of a low comedian, over-loudness and hardness of voice, and humorous luridity of manner. I was not there for the purpose of ridicule or curiosity. My aim was to hear arguments. So, like the most single-minded of Atheists, I surrendered myself to them. With the skill of a highly-trained gladiator, the lecturer lightly turned the thrusts that the world, matter, space, life, growth, and uniformity of design seemed naturally to deal against him. His voice rose to painful loudness, his passions swelled, his bitterness increased almost to Satanic dignity, as he scornfully reduced the very phrases of his imaginary opponents to absurdity, turned the weapons of their arguments against them, made their words suicidal, their reasoning a mockery. From this hurricane of passionate argument, would glance off side-gusts of invective against bigotry, priestly tyranny, and Christianity; stray storms of scorn against political corruption, despotic inanity, and the inequality of classes. But, however easy he found it to annihilate God, he found it more easy to annihilate man. An occasional ejaculation of dissent would bring down a tornado of rage, scorn, and satire, that swept deprecation into silence. My self-surrender was brief. Mr. Bradlaugh clothed his arguments and his system in a language of his own, so original, so profound, and so philosophic, that I gave up, when he closed a disproof of creation by assigning

as a result 'discontinuity of origination.' Although this was cheered, the cheer was not so enthusiastic as when he scathed some individual who ventured on a note of disagreement.

After all, sir, I do not think the question settled by Mr. Bradlaugh. At best, if all he said were undeniable, he only proved that there could be no God whom any one could conceive of. Give him your notion, your definition of a God, all-intelligent, infinite, or all-good, and he could at once, with the consummate skill of practice, put you in a dilemma and expose you to ridicule. If your God is all good, he would mockingly say, He would not have created so much evil, so much misery, so much war, so much pain. He is not all-good. There is no God. Mr. Bradlaugh is a man of extensive reading. He quoted Mill and Descartes. He advanced many original, many profound arguments; but the existence of evil was his most incisive, most triumphant, and his most effective. Yet, how does he know that evil is not a form, not merely a negation of good? Evil may be a greater good. Again, he said, 'All he knew was that he existed.' Suppose Mr. Bradlaugh an idiot. Would he know that he existed? Or suppose, merely suppose, Mr. Bradlaugh to be mad. Would he know that he existed, except in a lucid interval? If I assume that life is sleep, then he only knows in the lucid intervals of waking that he exists.

Discussion was invited, and Mr. Bradlaugh found it an arena of triumph. Sleights of argument, caustic wit, skill in retort, power of ridicule, cunning in fence, are weapons which he uses with precision and relish. One respectable but extremely foolish Methodist class-leader, began his proof of the existence of a God by the boast that his father had been the greatest drunkard and gambler in Lancashire. Called to order, he floundered on through religious common-places for ten minutes, and had to sit down and submit to the keen ridicule and incisive retort hailed down on him. An old man piped out a good deal of verbosity, interspersed, however, with some very stiff dialectic puzzles; but difficult to hear and more difficult to understand than the lecturer had been. Mr. Bradlaugh very conveniently declined to answer. But he succeeded in convincing one obstinate opponent, who insisted on asking a question, but who had not heard the lecture. As he mildly again asked leave, he was ordered by Mr. Bradlaugh to leave the room. Still he hesitated. With all the majesty of insulted logic, Mr. Bradlaugh dismounted from the platform, vowing that he would himself apply the persuasion of force. This argument triumphed. The obstinate dialectician, by the simultaneous rush of

several Atheists, was effectually convinced—that he had better go home. I think he was about the only person convinced that evening.

Whatever impressions Mr. Bradlaugh's lecture made on me were shocked by the satisfaction which petty triumphs over eager stupidity and weaponless opponents caused to glow in his face and sparkle in his eye. I can never be regenerated to Atheism. Its creed is Secularism and Socialism in their least alluring aspects; its religion is politics, and its politics are revolution. Its Avatar is Bradlaugh; and

an Avatar who unites the issue of cheap and nasty political pamphlets to the mission of regenerating mankind, lacks the dignity which the apostle of a new system ought to have. I cannot see the dignity of victorious truth in a sect which, when kicked by a bishop, obtrusively vaunts the kick on every possible occasion, and makes more capital out of the episcopal too than any other sect would make out of a panegyric three hours long from the episcopal mouth."

I am, yours faithfully,

PYRRHO.

SECULARISM.*

MR. HARRISON, on rising, was received with immense cheering, several times renewed. He said that perhaps a few words from him might not be entirely useless in regard to the reason that brought Mr. Bradlaugh and him together on the platform. It was well that it should be rightly understood by the audience. It was well known to many persons that on several occasions he had lectured upon Mr. Bradlaugh's Secularism, and that on several occasions also he had been challenged to discuss the subject with Mr. Bradlaugh himself. Those challenges, he would frankly state, had been for the most part declined, but some time ago, he was challenged by the Newcastle Secular Society, in effect, to state in Mr. Bradlaugh's presence what he had elsewhere stated with respect to him. Now, he hoped that his Secularist friends would not consider it was owing to cowardice that he had not taken up the challenge sooner. He said so much to show that the encounter was not of his seeking, and he had no desire to meet a professional lecturer in public discussion. After a few other introductory remarks, Mr. Harrison went on to state that the proposition for discussion that evening was—"Secularism, distinctively considered, is not a system of

truth, and therefore cannot justify its existence in the reason." That proposition naturally divided itself into two parts, and the arguments upon which the proposition is founded might be divided into two parts. First of all, that "Secularism, distinctively considered, is not a system of truth." In support of that we would state three points. The first was that Secularism claimed to be a system that was a system of truth; the second was that if you take from Secularism that which does not belong to it, distinctively considered, there is nothing but Atheism left, and, therefore, that Secularism, distinctively considered, is Atheism; the third is, that inasmuch as Secularism, distinctively considered, is Atheism, it cannot be a system of truth, first, because it has no truth to offer; and secondly, because it is not a system at all. (Applause.) The second part of his argument might be stated in this way—that, in the first place, for the justification of the existence of any alleged system, the reason requires that in fact it shall be a system, and not only a system, but the system which it professes to be; that Secularism, inasmuch as it is Atheism, is neither in fact a system, nor the system which it professes to be, and, therefore, that Secularism, as such, cannot

* The "Rev." Mr. Harrison, Wesleyan, and C. Bradlaugh engaged in public discussion, in Newcastle-on-Tyne, on September 14 and 15. We give the opening speech as reported in the *Newcastle Daily Telegraph*.—ED.

justify its existence to the reason. He had thus gone through every point of his general argument in order to show Mr. Bradlaugh clearly and distinctly what was to be answered, and that there might be no surprises on the introduction of new matter after his first speech. He would now proceed to explain his arguments in detail. In the first place, Secularism claimed to be a system of truth. Having referred to the writings of Mr. Watts and Mr. Holyoake; as to the principles of Secularism, he proceeded to remark that it must be apparent to the audience that Secularism claimed to be a system. Further still, Mr. Bradlaugh himself spoke of Secularism as teaching certain laws. In connection with his second position, that if everything not properly belonging to Secularism were taken away, there was nothing left but Atheism, and, therefore, that Secularism, distinctively considered, was Atheism, he made the following quotations, respecting the work of Secularism, from the printed report of the debate between Mr. Holyoake and Mr. Bradlaugh:—1. "A system of compulsory Secular Education, so that each child may, at starting in life, be placed in a fair condition to form more correct opinions, and to be fitted for more useful conduct. 2. The disestablishment and disendowment of the State Church, and the placing all religions and forms of speculative opinion on a perfect equality before the law. 3. Specially the improvement of the condition of the agricultural classes, whose terrible state of social degradation is at present a fatal barrier to the formation of a good state of society. 4. A change in the land laws, so as to break down the present system, by which enormous estates are found in a few hands—the many having no interest in the soil—and to secure for the agricultural labourer some share of the improvement in the land he cultivates. 5. The des-

truction of the present hereditary Chamber of Peers, and the substitution of a Senate, containing life members, elected for their fitness, and therewith the constitution of a national party intended to wrest the governing power from a few Whig and Tory families. 6. The investigation of the causes of poverty in all old countries, in order to see how far unequal distribution of wealth or more radical causes may operate. The discussion in connection with this of the various schemes for social amelioration, and the ascertainment, if possible, of the laws governing the increase of population and produce, and affecting the rise and fall of wages." Now, he would ask whether Mr. Bradlaugh, or any other Secularist so-called, was prepared to prove that those six points were peculiar to those who were distinctively so-called Secularists. That was the point he wished to have settled. He supposed there was not one in the audience that would not say there was anything in such work in which anyone socially and politically could not engage; only if it be consonant with the views he held politically rather than religiously—as a citizen of England, and not at all in his theological character. (Applause.) It was not necessary, for instance, to become a sceptic to be an advocate of a compulsory system of education. Was Mr. Robjohns, was Mr. Rutherford, was he himself a sceptic for having expressed similar views with regard to education? (Applause.) In the same debate, as he found from page 14 of the published pamphlet, the following was said by Mr. Bradlaugh:—"It is going to teach men, as Mr. Holyoake explained in his very able exposition of Secularism in the Cowper Street debate with Mr. Grant; the physical laws on which health depends; the moral laws on which happiness depends; the intellectual laws on which knowledge depends; the social and political

laws on which material prosperity and advancement depends; the economic laws on which wealth depends." He asked if they were not all agreed as to what those laws were? It seemed to him perfectly absurd to say that in the quotation there was the slightest difference between the distinctive principles of Secularism, so called, and those of any other person in the country. He would give another quotation from the debate:—"Although at present it may be perfectly true that all men who are Secularists are not yet Atheists, I put it to you as also perfectly true, that in my opinion the logical consequence of the acceptance of Secularism must be that the man gets to Atheism, if he has brains to comprehend." Now, when they took away from Secularism those things held in common, there was absolutely nothing left but Atheism. His next point was that inasmuch as Secularism was Atheism, it is not, and cannot be, a system of truth. In the first place, because it had no truth to offer; and secondly, it was no system at all. Were they to ask the Secularist about the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, the answer was either, "I don't know," or "I deny." Well, if ignorance or denial was not knowledge, and, therefore, when they came to a question of this sort, the only thing that could be got was either ignorance or denial. But it might be said—let us pass to questions about the universe and the constitution of human nature. Upon these Atheism said nothing either, because in the one case we passed into the regions of positive science, and when human nature was mentioned, we passed into mental philosophy; and he believed in positive science and mental philosophy as much as any man living on the face of the earth. (Great applause.) It thus appeared that no truth could be got from Atheism. It appeared to him there were only three forms in which Atheism could be put. It

might take the form of doubt; then Mr. Holyoake's Atheism took the form of ignorance, and as to Mr. Bradlaugh's Atheism, he was prepared to show that it appeared to be a compound of ignorance and of denial. (Laughter.) In saying this he did not mean any disrespect to Mr. Bradlaugh. (Hear, hear, from Mr. Bradlaugh.) He was simply endeavouring to show what was the logical conclusion of certain words. They had already seen that a system could not be built up of ignorance and denial, and if that could not be done separately, he did not think it could be built up of both together. The first position under the second part of his argument was this—the justification and existence of any alleged system of reason requires that it shall in effect be a system, and *the* system it proposes to be. It was a matter of absolute necessity in the interests of free thought that statement and fact should correspond with each other. Secularism was not what it proposed to be, and, therefore, failed to justify its existence to the reason. Secularism was in fact an utterly false representation of the thing Atheism. (Applause.) Mr. Harrison went on to say that certainly for his part no bitterness should be brought into this controversy, and he would sink any question that might arise as to sincerity. He would content himself with saying that he would accord to Mr. Bradlaugh his rights as a man. (Applause.) But while he said this with perfect frankness, he had no mercy for Secularism—not a bit. He would treat the subject with justice, but mercy it did not deserve. (Loud applause.) Secularism appeared to him to be mischievous, misleading, and bearing a false name; and if the thing be Atheism, let the name correspond with the fact. (Renewed applause.) Mr. Harrison then recapitulated his various arguments, and resumed his seat amidst immense cheering.

MINISTER MAKING—COLLEGES, &c,

Sir,—I am not surprised to find in your last issue a letter from a correspondent who has evidently felt the sting of that remarkable statement by the Bishop of Manchester. My own experience may throw some light on this unpleasant picture. The remarks could not apply to any *connexional ministry*. The various churches draw their young ministers from the ranks of "their local preachers," whose fitness for their post is always well attested, so much so that no human forethought could devise better means of guarding against unsuitable men finding their way into the ranks of their ministry. Not so with our Independent brethren. If I understand correctly there the working of it is as follows:—A devout family will have a son on whose behalf the parents will have much anxiety, and often ask the anxious question, "What shall we make of our lad?" He is kept at school year after year, while he is too old for business; and parents often thinking their "dear boy" too good for their own trade, or some other that is within their reach, look out and think the ministry just the thing.

Assuming that the parents are truly honest in their choice and really happy under the ministration of some devout, intelligent, holy man, they settle the question and send their son to some college to be further trained for the ministry. The well-disposed lad obeys his parents, and soon finds himself a student of sacred theology. A two or three years' training, and his education being completed, he is turned out, and returns home, where he waits a "call." Weeks and months pass over, and he is occasionally desired to occupy the pulpit of some sickly minister who is off to the sea-side to recruit his health, or some

vacant pulpit desires him for the day. So he goes on month after month, yet no call. He begins to think that he has mistaken his mission, or that the organisation of his sect is defective, or that people are strangely blind not to see him, so well as he could serve them. His friends, too, begin to think that their lad has been a great expense to them, and they see no hope of his being settled in the Independent ministry, so they look about them out of their ranks. Now, Dr. Frazer is just the man to catch the eye of these young ex-students, whose only strong feeling has been to get into the ministry. The Bishop is warm-hearted, zealous, charitable, frank, and kind, and to him they turn as a last hope.

It has been my lot to live all my life in a small town, for which, in my opinion, Independency is in no way adapted, *as it now exists*. We have a chapel with every comfort we can desire, but never succeed in raising a permanent interest, hence our pulpit is often vacant, and when so we have usually drawn our supplies from the colleges nearest, who have been good enough to send their students, and, oh, such sticks!! the majority of them are that I blush to think of them, and wish in my very soul they were safely under the wings of the good Bishop of Manchester. The fact is the *raw material* is not right; their piety is right, so also their good intentions, but they are the right men in the wrong place, they get into the ministry, but the ministry does not get into them.

I understand that in all successful enterprises there is such a thing as "the fitness of things," and so there must be here. My hat fits my head, but would be of no use on my feet. These well-disposed young men do not fit our modern Independ-

* This letter from the *Christian World*, indicates the trouble prevalent in making ministers under the one man system. Some useful things may be suggested to the reader.—ED.

dent pulpits. The pew is in advance of them, and silently but effectually casts them off; and if I might here say a word to the Bishop of Manchester, it would be,—Sir, accept them; they are just the thing for you; they are from pious parents, well trained, well educated, can read well, and in all respects will answer your purpose. Of course these remarks do not apply to all the young students sent us; among them there have been those who will,

if health and life permit, make their mark on the world, and under whose ministry, I should only be too happy to sit; but I refer to those representatives mentioned in the sermon at Chorley, and bitterly regret that more care is not taken to exclude such young men whose "vanity" culminates in so much "vexation of spirit" and injury to our common cause.—Yours faithfully,

J. VARLOW.

Caistor, Aug. 28, 1870.

RESTRICTED COMMUNION.

If any one thing is clearer than another in God's Word, it is this—that the first churches were made up of baptized believers, and that infant baptism and infant membership were unknown, consequently there could be no such thing as open Communion. If open Communion has no foundation in the Scriptures, then it is a wrong thing, a thing which stands right in the face of the commission. It has a tendency to weaken that respect which believers ought to have for divine authority. Open Communion, like infant sprinkling, has no foundation in the Word of God; both are the creation of human fancy, both hostile to the authority of Christ. Infant baptism, invented by the Man of Sin, to increase his power, has flooded the Church with the ungodly, and open Communion is a kind of compromise between truth and error,—between the command of Christ and an invention of man,—and on the part of an immersed believer, a great inconsistency; for he must receive and fellowship a person sprinkled in

infancy as a baptized person, or he must receive him as unbaptized; in either case he does a thing which no Apostle would have dared to do. To contend for open Communion as Scripture is to contend for what never existed, and what could not exist, without changing Christ's commission and the nature and constitution of the Apostolic Churches. Before men contend for open Communion, they should first establish the fact of its existence in the Apostolic Churches; then, their conduct would be reasonable, they would be contending for something; till then, they are seeking to build on a dream, a creation of their own fancy, which can only tend to deepen prejudice and cause strife, and lay down stumbling-blocks in the path of the Christian, to hinder him from doing his duty; but can never overturn the words of Christ: "If ye love me keep my commandments," or, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you."—John xiv. 15, 21; xv. 13.—*Canadian Baptist*.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

DEAR BRO. LISTER,—As usual, I have taken a pleasure trip for recreation. I took the trip to Oshawa, hearing that Bro. Franklin

was there, as I love to hear all the good things I can from those engaged in the Master's cause. I could not resist going to hear our

Bro. Franklin, and am happy to say he did not disappoint me. His style is original, voice powerful at will—at other times smooth and distinct. He holds the audience by force of argument and illustration. He reminds me much of John B. Gough; for at one time you will see the smiles playing upon their faces and many biting their lips to keep from laughing outright. But he will not leave them long in that way; for soon he has many in tears—others in great agitation. Even those who do not agree with him commend his

strong and irrefutable arguments. During his stay thirteen made the good confession. I must not forget Bro. Sheppard on Lord's day morning. He gave the right hand of fellowship to those who had obeyed; and the few well-timed remarks to the candidates brought tears of joy from many eyes. It was good to be there. The house was filled to its utmost capacity. Many who came had to return home because the house would not hold them.

J. H. R.

WHERE SHALL I BE MARRIED?

WE have more than once directed attention to the marriage of Dissenters at the places of worship belonging to the Establishment,—a practice which is as inconsistent as it is cowardly; for of what use are a man's principles if he is ashamed practically to avow them in the more important steps of his life? The practice is, besides, a reflection on Nonconformist ministers, and unjust to Nonconformity itself. We have a fresh instance of the use made of it, in a recent number of the *Church Herald*, where an account is given of a Primitive Methodist young woman leaving her own place of worship, in order to be married at the parish church. The writer in the *Church Herald* thus reflects upon the case:—

“After banns, her marriage was duly solemnised in her parish church, and she received with her husband God's blessing at the hands of one of his priests. Now, does not this fact show that however Dissent may

satisfy some of the cravings or wants of its followers, it has not their whole confidence, else why did this good woman ignore so totally the pretensions of Dissenters to the claim of being equally with the clergy of the Church God's ministers and ambassadors? Does it not rather prove, without contradiction, that, in the face of everything to the contrary, the Church's divine constitution and office is recognised and venerated whenever the Gospel of its founder has been preached even by those who live in open separation from her? Is it not strong evidence that Dissent does not really believe in its heart the teaching it endeavours to inculcate with its lips?”

The foregoing is from the *Liberator*, and is well worthy of attention. Where a Licensed Chapel is not near, the office of Registrar is always accessible, and no one need go to the State Church.

Ed.

ITEMS OF NEWS.

OHIO.—About two weeks ago Bro. Franklin, editor of the *Review*, commenced a series of meetings at Williamsville, about seven miles from our place. We attended some, but the two children frequently. On Monday morning we went to Winsville and

met our boy walking home. He conversed a few minutes and then said, “I was baptized last night.” We rejoiced, yet, secretly we wished we could have been there. Our girl had expressed a wish, and was yet at Winsville, but wished to see some of her

old companions first. They met, and on Tuesday evening she and three of her companions, about the same age, went with her, besides two or three others, and were buried with the Lord! Since then, I hear over twenty more have been added to the Lord! So much for the labours of one man; and that after the meeting had been closed by the leading agents of the missionary society, and they had said it would be no use holding more meetings, for not twenty-one would attend. Bro. Franklin is a plain man, but very powerful. How much I wished I could have been at home last Lord's-day, and seen my dear children, with several others, received into the church. For when I left some fourteen had been baptized, and at least six would unite with our church.

T. B. S.

DUNDEE.—Although the church cannot be said to be making great headway among the surrounding people, it is, nevertheless, holding its position with unanimity and firmness, and exhibiting christianity as it was at first taught by the apostles. Several very earnest and intelligent brethren labour indefatigably, and endeavour by word and example to make the house of God all it ought to be to the christian disciple and the sinner. Bro. Rae, evangelist, who has been located here for upwards of two years, and during that time has been the means of improving the spiritual life of the church and bringing sinners to seek the protection of the Good Shepherd, left this place in the beginning of the month to commence labour in Fife and elsewhere. On Sunday, the 4th inst., we were greatly refreshed by the visit of Bro. Joseph Adam, who preached to large audiences in the forenoon and afternoon. In the absence of an evangelist the church is bestirring itself to do all it can to spread the truth, and to that end a new scheme of operations has been resolved upon by the overseers, who have likewise opened a Bible Class and a Sunday School. Sunday last was the occasion of more than ordinary rejoicing, as on that day two intelligent persons—a young man and his wife—

entered the kingdom of our Lord by being baptized into His name. Other fruit is expected; and the prospects are encouraging. We trust the Lord will bless those who are serving Him, and that at last it may be said of them individually—"Thou hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast laboured, and hast not fainted."

15th Sept., 1870.

T. Y. M.

NORTH SHIELDS.—We have had a visit of over seven days from Bro. J. Adam, resulting in the addition of one to our number by baptism, and in other advantageous effects. We hope soon to see him again.

J. G.

CAM-YE-ALLEN.—A young man obeyed the Lord, by immersion into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, on the 27th August.

W. G.

Obituary.

WILLIAM SMITH, of Mullaghmore, county Tyrone, Ireland, departed this life, August 17th, 1870, in the 69th year of his age. He was well known to many of the brethren in England, who, from time to time, have visited the church in this place, and who will revere his memory, but only those who met with him around the Lord's table, and who can testify to his love and zeal and faithfulness, really know his worth. His brief earnest exhortations and fervent prayers will long be remembered by us. His deep interest in the truth was manifest to the end. Jesus was his only hope, and through Him he triumphed in death and gave full testimony that his faith was unshaken. We have buried our brother in the sure hope of a resurrection unto eternal life, and we trust to meet him when shouts of triumph shall greet our returning Lord. Bro. Smith was a member of the church for thirty-nine years, being baptized in the year 1831, and was never absent on the Lord's day, except prevented by sickness.

I. K. TENER.

Family Room.

THE TRAINING ELEMENT IN EDUCATION.

At all times and in all places, education is a matter of primary importance, and its importance now is, in some measure, felt and acknowledged. It has become the question of the day. Of late years much attention has been directed to

the distinction between teaching and training. The effort was needed, and has been useful. The tendency in a former age to pile up reading, writing, and a few other kindred arts, and call them education, was superficial in its philosophy, and

disastrous in its practical results. There cannot be training without teaching; but there may be teaching without training. The various branches of knowledge which the teaching imparts constitute, as it were, the elements which the trainer employs. They are the types skilfully cast, and lying in the fount before him; but they have little meaning and less power, until they have been arranged and submitted to the press. Moral training, according to the Divine standard, with the view of moulding the human being, while yet young and tender, into right principles and habits of action, and using up in its processes all kinds and degrees of information within its reach, is the only education worthy of the name. So much of late has been done in this department, and so familiar have the intelligent portion of the community become with the subject, that though it comes most naturally in our way, we do not think it necessary in this place either to explain what moral training is, or to enforce its paramount importance in education. The oldest training-school is still the best,—home is the best schoolroom, sisters and brothers the best class-fellows, parents the best schoolmasters. The chief value of those charitable institutions for the training of the young, which characterise and honour our age, consists in supplying the lack of home education. These schools deserve all the praise bestowed on them; but it is on the principle that when the best has entirely failed, the next best is very precious. To make well in the industrial school is good, but to keep well in the home is better. But in all these the beautiful law of Providence appears, that good principles and habits, as well as bad, help each other. Suppose the case of a father and mother, personally deficient in education, but desiring to have their children trained to

truth and righteousness. Observe how the various portions of the machinery work together for good. In giving them children and filling their hearts with parental love, God has supplied them with the best exercise for improvement, and the most powerful motive to urge them on. Love to the little ones will make them try the training, and each trial will increase their capacity for the work. Every effort to train their children will elevate themselves, and every degree to which they attain will be an addition to their power of doing good to the children. If we do not train the children in truth and righteousness, it would be better that we should not train them at all. Here we meet full in the face the old question, "What is truth?" Christ is the truth and the Scriptures the standard by which it may be known. If we do not adopt the Bible as our standard in training the young, combined training is impossible. If moral training has any substantial existence, it is a training according to the rule and under the authority of the Bible, as the revealed will of God. The objection to scriptural doctrine in the training of the young, proceeds upon the assumption that if you imbue the mind with opinions before the judgment is capable of independently sifting the evidence, the ultimate issue cannot be a reasonable service. To leave the mind throughout childhood without prepossessions in regard to religious truth is simply impossible. The question does not lie between furnishing the mind with opinions in youth and leaving it empty. Left empty it cannot be. We are limited to the alternative of filling with the sifted wheat of truth, or abandoning it to be occupied with the flying chaff of various error. If you do not employ the Bible as an authoritative rule in the training of your child, you have decided for your child against the authority of the Bible. When he has, under

your training, grown up to manhood without God in the world, you cannot bring him back to the softness of childhood again, to correct the error, if error there has been. It is a blessed employment to be leading little ones to Jesus. We know that it is a service with which the Lord

Himself is well pleased. Those neglected wanderers, when gathered in, constitute the kingdom and satisfy the desire of the King. To gather them is honourable work, and a well-doing of which Christians should never be weary.

Free Gospel Mag.

LITTLE HUNGRY MINDS.

EVERY parent know what is meant by this, That incessant asking of questions, so characteristic of children, is annoying at times, it must be admitted. But seek not to wholly stifle the child's desire to ask questions. A process of education is going on in the little mind, which it is desirable to encourage by every possible means. Under the child's strange questions may lurk a meaning which even the philosopher cannot penetrate. Refuse to satisfy the intellectual hunger of the little mind, and the appetite for knowledge, the disposition to observe, to speculate, to wonder, to inquire, may suffer. The little earnest efforts discouraged, may nip in the bud those aspirations of the immature intellect, which might have led in the process of years to the fulness and the glory of the ripened mind. Bear, then, with the little hungry mind; and, at proper

periods, and in every proper way, endeavour to satisfy its restless curiosity. For in this way shall the healthy mental activity of the child be kept up, and its mind preserved from becoming a barren waste, or from producing only noxious and poisonous weeds. And though children's questions may seem trivial, or even meaningless, depend upon it they are not so. Sympathy with the child—the habit of looking at things from its point of view, of entering into its ideas and feelings, will soon convince any one of the truth of this; and, besides, prove by no means an unprofitable exercise. For by sympathy with the little mind, we catch something of its healthy hunger, something of the freshness of its desires; and thus may we ourselves be greatly benefited whilst promoting the best interests of our children.

Selected.

THE WORDS WE SPEAK.

THE words we speak—will they not be monuments of what we were when we have passed away? Many of those words may have been carelessly dropped, but they have left their impress for ever engraven upon the imperishable tablets of the human mind. Time cannot efface them, and their influence will be made manifest when God shall judge the world for the “deeds done in the body.” They will tell how much of good or evil we shall reap. We do not always rightly judge of the full import of our words; how far they may be instrumental in helping to form the characters of

those with whom we come in contact; and that they reveal our character and disposition to those around us.

A writer, whose name will be as imperishable as his words, has said, “Write your name by kindness, love and mercy upon the hearts of the thousands you come in contact with.” Can we not write with word as well as deeds, by dropping words of love and kindness into the heart's deep well?

We are called upon every day of our lives to give words of love, kindness and encouragement, and also words of reproof, which should fall

softly that they may gently heal, at the same time probe the wound, revealing its deadly nature. Words of kindness, and encouragement have accomplished good which eternity alone can tell. How many have gone forth under the influence of such into the world and braved its cares and trials, and have won for themselves honour and renown in this, and life everlasting in the world to

come. And those words of "eternal life" that were borne to man by the Son of God—they are those priceless treasures, those jewels whose splendour emanates from a throne of love to light our pathway through this world and guide us safe through the dark valley of death, until we stand surrounded by the resplendent glory of the Throne in the presence of the great I AM. M. A. B.

GOD A LOVER OF BEAUTY.

"We doubt not that God is a lover of Beauty. We speak reverently. He fashioned the worlds in Beauty, when there was no eye to behold them but his own. All along the wild forest he has carved the forms of Beauty. Every cliff, and stem, and flower is a form of Beauty. Every hill, and dale, and landscape is a picture of Beauty. Every cloud, and mist-wreath, and vapour-veil is a shadowy reflection of Beauty. Every spring and rivulet, river and ocean, is a glossy mirror of Beauty. Every diamond, and rock and pebbly beach is a mine of Beauty. Every sea, and planet, and star, is a blazing face of Beauty. All along the aisles

of earth, all over the arches of heaven, all through the expanse of the universe, are scattered in rich and infinite profusion, the life-gems of Beauty. All natural motion is Beauty in action. The winds, the waves, the clouds, the trees, the birds, the animals, all move beautifully, and beautifully do the light-world of the skies dance their eternal cotillion of glory. From the mote that plays its little frolic in the sun-beam, to the world that blazes along the sapphire spaces of the firmament, are visible the ever-varying features of the enrapturing spirit of Beauty. All this great realm of dazzling and bewildering Beauty was made of God."

SWEEPING AND DUSTING.

A LADY said to her chambermaid: "Sarah, I am going out; I should like to have you sweep my room and dust it while I am gone."

"Yes, ma'am," said Sarah; and her mistress left the house.

An hour or two after she returned, and found her furniture covered with dust. She called Sarah.

"Sarah, I wished you to sweep and dust my room during my absence; why didn't you do it?"

"But I did ma'am. You were no sooner out of the house, than I took my duster and went carefully over everything in the room, I am sure there was not a speck of dust left. And then I swept the room nicely."

"So you dusted my room and swept it."

"I did, ma'am, indeed."

"Well, Sarah, what I told you to do was to sweep and dust it. The sweeping was first and the dusting last. You have not done as I told you. It did no harm to dust before sweeping, but you should have dusted afterward, in order to fulfill my direction."

The lady was a Christian. Her Lord had told her, "Repent and be baptized." Long before repenting she was sprinkled for baptism. Then, when grown up, she repented too, but she was never baptized afterward. What she said to her servant is like

what the Master says to her. "I told you to repent and be baptized. You have not done as I told you. The repenting came first; the being baptized came last."

Strange that we should exact better obedience of our servants than we are willing to render to Christ.—

The Baptist Teacher.

THE EARNEST ENTREATY.

"Forsake me not."—Psa. lxx. 8.

THERE are two other passages which we should consider along with this, viz., 2 Chron., xv. 2. and Heb. xiii. 6. "The Lord is with you while ye be with Him, and if ye seek Him he will be found of you, but if ye forsake Him He will forsake you." "He hath said I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." In these two texts we have a precept and a promise; and in the first we have a prayer. The precept stands associated with a threatening; the promise, with some counsel to avoid covetousness and cherish contentment; while the prayer comes commended to us as having been used by one who should be a pattern to us. It may be that while reading the precept we see that we have so failed as to incur the threatening, and while surveying the promise, that we have very often neglected the kind counsel given; and then we feel that our only resource is prayer. Oh! it is a mercy if after all we find it in our hearts to look up to God and say, "Forsake me not."

These few emphatic words remind us of the personal nature of religion—"Me." This is especially felt in prayer. Alas for him who only prays in a congregation, or kneels down with a family, but enters not into his

own closet. If we listen to those earnest saints whose prayers the Bible records, we hear each one speaking personally to God, we have such words as, "My iniquity," "My sins," "My trouble," "My enemies," "My help," "My refuge," "My soul," "My God." Thus every one knows his own sore and his own grief, has his own burden, his own errand and request.

These words "Forsake me not" imply some persuasions existing in the Psalmist's mind. He knew that God had been with him, yea, was with him, in some measure, still; also, that the absence of God's presence and help would be his greatest loss. "There is (says one) a remedy for everything but the loss of God's favour." And that they shall never lose who really desire to attain it. God will "never, no never, no never forsake," the soul who pleads with Him, "Forsake me not." Let us cherish the pleading spirit. Read those Psalms which describe the prayers and supplications of Messiah when on earth, and see how eminently He possessed it. We should seek in this as in all other things, to have the spirit and mind of Christ.

J. C.

ENEMIES.

HAVE you enemies? Go straight on, and mind them not. If they block up your path, walk round them, and do your duty regardless of their spite. A man who has no enemies is seldom good for anything: he is

made of that kind of material which is so easily worked, that every one has a hand in it. A sterling character—one who thinks for himself, and speaks what he thinks—is always sure to have enemies. They are as

necessary to him as fresh air; they keep him alive and active. A celebrated character, who was surrounded by enemies, used to remark—"They are sparks which, if you do not blow, will go out of themselves." Let this be your feeling while endeavouring to live down the scandal of those who are bitter against you.

If you stop to dispute you do but as they desire, and open the way for more abuse. Let the poor fellows talk; there will be a reaction if you perform but your duty, and hundreds who were once alienated from you will flock to you, and acknowledge their error.

LOVELINESS.

It is not your neat dress, your expensive shawl, or your pretty fingers that attract the attention of men of sense. They look beyond these. It is the true loveliness of your nature that wins and continues to retain the affections of the heart. Young ladies sadly miss it who labour to improve their outward looks, while they bestow not a

thought on the mind. Fools may be won by gew-gaws and fashionable showy dresses; but the wise and substantial are never caught by such traps. Let modesty be your dress. Use pleasant and agreeable language, and though you may not be courted by the fop and the sop, the good and truly great will love to linger in your steps.

EDITORIAL.

SINCE the attention of the Annual Meeting was called to the necessity of promoting a much wider circulation of our literature, among those who are beyond our communion, various communications have indicated some desire to move in that direction. To facilitate the carrying out of that desire we intend, at the close of the present year, to make considerable alterations in the *British Harbinger*, perhaps changing both its form and title, but certainly completely remodelling its contents. In this respect it will become a NEWSPAPER; not, indeed, a record of police reports, but a recorder of passing events affecting the Ecclesiasticisms of our time and bearing upon the religious, social, and educational, conditions of the people. War and peace; the decay or fall of old apostacies and the birth and growth of new ones; strivings of infidelity and contentings for the faith; news of Churches in Europe, America, and our Colonies, will be recorded, or commented upon as understood to bear upon the work, duty, faith, and hope of Christians. The liberation of religion from State control; the unsectarian and compulsory education of the whole of the nation, and kindred movements, will have due attention. If our title be changed, perhaps "*The Ecclesiastical Observer*" might not prove an inappropriate designation.

The new postal regulations will afford facilities, but then we must, in order to secure them, become fairly and completely a newspaper, within the meaning of the Act of Parliament. Our own opinion is that already *The Harbinger* is that, but such is not the conclusion of the postal authorities. But this point we need not dispute, because we need to advance to a wider grasp of passing issues, and that, too, to an extent more than ample to entitle us to register as a newspaper. We need this because our circulation cannot be otherwise widely extended beyond our own associations. We are, then, open to any suggestions which our friends may offer.

Our next number, while not exhibiting what we intend to realize after the close of the present year, will, nevertheless, so far as the character of its contents is concerned, indicate the nature of the intended changes.

Ed.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL OBSERVER.

OUR readers, for the most part, are (what all should be) Ecclesiastical Observers; or persons who particularly note whatever appertains to the churches. "God is in history," and He has ever had a people among the peoples of the earth, and the movements of the nations have ever been over-ruled with special reference to the Elect of God, whether (as under the former dispensation) that Elect be a nation or a people called out from the nation, as is the Church. He who *observes* whatever appertains to the Church—that is to say, *whatever* seriously bears upon it, either for good or ill—has a large field to watch over. Peace largely affects the Church. The influence of War is not more restricted in range, nor is it less powerful. Educational movements all affect, and, therefore, in an allowable sense, appertain to the Church, and challenge the attention of the *Ecclesiastical Observer*. Science has its bearing both upon the Church and the Bible, and therefore there should be a vigilant eye, in order to detect science falsely so called, when it comes in the name and garb of the real and the true. Who can look at the last two sessions of the British Parliament without perceiving that almost every day some measure affecting more or less the Church has been, in some way, before one or the other of the two Houses? These measures affect many churches—false churches and true churches. Some, when passed, we ought to take advantage of; and in regard to others, duty calls us to lend a helping hand to place them upon the Statute Book. The recent Educational Bill opens a door for much good, and, at the same time, another for much evil. Changes will have to be made, and that ere long, and every true church should wield its influence promptly and well. The State Church question is pressing hard upon us, also other questions affecting the progress of the truth as it is in Jesus.

As *Ecclesiastical Observers* we have first and continuously to fix a steady gaze upon the Primitive and Apostolic Church—upon Christianity, pure and simple, as presented in the New Testament. We should be, pre-eminently, *Bible Observers*. Where the Bible speaks we must speak, and what the Bible says we must say, and yet must we speak scientifically, and not dogmatically. Let us so observe the primitive order and faith that we shall succeed in restoring them where they have been departed from and in standing by them where they are restored.

We have also particularly to observe those churches which, though not of the primitive order, are nearest to it. This we should do to be ready to embrace every opportunity to bring them to the desired ground.

All churches should be observed that we may adopt whatever good they have (compatible with apostolic rule), and be ready to aid them with information and help whenever a favourable moment arrives for so doing.

Infidelity, in a sense, appertains to the Church. It fastens upon it and determines to overthrow it. But watch it well and treat it wisely and, so far from proving an unmitigated evil, we shall find that, by compelling investigation, it clears away rubbish and brings out the truth in clearer light. There is much untruth thrown over the doctrine of Christ and His Apostles, and the times that now are will shake what can be shaken, that that which cannot be shaken may remain. Praise Jehovah! God, and Christ, His Church, and the One Faith and Hope, will remain for ever!

We hope steadfastly to remain a vigilant *Observer of Things Ecclesiastical*, and we pray that our pages from time to time may open the eyes of many,

that they too may observe the things that directly appertain to the Church of God, as also those which affect it indirectly.

WATCHMEN! What of the night? The night is far spent; the day is at hand; and now is our salvation nearer than when we believed.

FRANCE AND ITALY—THE WAR AND THE POPE.

AT LAST Italy is one—one from the Tarentine Gulf to the Alps, and Rome is her capital. The temporal power of the Pope is gone, never to be restored. Pius IX, there can be no doubt, closes for ever the long line of Pope-kings; the twelve hundred and sixty years of power to persecute the saints has expired, and the end, by overthrow and consuming, has come precisely as predicted. Not that Roman Catholics admit that the temporal power has finally closed. They insist that a temporary suspension is permitted, and that the Popes will regain their power as heretofore. They ask, Why not? seeing that Rome has again and again been wrested from them, and yet the Pope has been restored. But never has it been as now. The entire circumstances are changed. This is clearly the end, not of the Roman Church, but of the temporal power. The "time, times, and dividing of time," or the period of persecuting power, has terminated. The people of the remnant of Papal territory have voted themselves, with extraordinary unanimity, subjects of Victor Emanuel, and, as has been well said, "At its last hour the temporal power has gone down like a decayed tree, which was rotten within although it looked strong externally. The defiant proclamation of General Kanzler, and the swaggering obstinacy of his Zouaves, were the immediate prelude to a humiliating discomfiture. There was a little show of resistance at Civit  Castellana, a little burning of powder under the walls of Rome itself, and then, the word being given to admit Cadorna, the great city passed from the priests to the people. When the Emperor Napoleon entered upon his ill-fated campaign he took advantage of his disregarded protests against the proclamation of Infallibility to withdraw the corps of occupation. Probably some other reason existed for that step, besides the desire of employing the five or six thousand troops thus disengaged; but, at any rate, it sealed the fate of the temporal sovereignty. So soon as the Imperial cause collapsed, the King of Italy had no longer any choice. If he had hesitated to act, the Party of Action, already actively preparing its measures, would have been beforehand with him. He did not hesitate; he offered the Pontiff terms as indulgent as the situation permitted, and sent forty thousand soldiers to occupy the States of the Church. The '*Non possumus*' was vainly shrieked, for events had deprived the Vatican of every ally. The Roman people were estranged; Austria had washed her hands of the connection; Prussia gave Victor Emanuel *carte blanche* to act; and, with little more than a military promenade, Italy took possession of her capital. From end to end of the beautiful and classic Kingdom there reigns at this hour an unspeakable joy. Old quarrels and enmities are forgotten in the intoxicating delight of political completeness and secured freedom. Florence rings all her bells, Naples is in wild *fecla*, the hundred cities of the land sing songs in honour of 'Rome, our capital,' and every Italian is beside himself with gladness, because 'Italy is made.' Yet grand as the event is for the young kingdom, it is greater for humanity, since all civilization is concerned in the momentous issue. Anything else which may happen as the consequence of the present war

possesses, so to speak, but a local interest in comparison with the fact that the Pope of Rome is no longer a sovereign Prince, or rules only that small kingdom of 'the Vatican and a garden' which was rejected with disdain eight years ago. It was the Archbishop of Westminster who said, in his requiem sermon upon Mentana, 'A Pope subject to a royal supremacy, would reduce the spiritual supremacy to absurdity.' If we have briefly dwelt upon the enormous prolongation of the temporal power, its deep roots shot back into the eocene strata of civilization, its imposing pedigree, and far-reaching pretensions, it was with the view of showing how vast a relief from a supremacy irreconcilable with modern ideas the nineteenth century has at length secured. The wonder is, not that such a bulwark of ecclesiastical despotism withstood so long, but rather that it should have yielded at last, even after the centuries of siege laid to it by all the passionate and ardent soldiers of human freedom—by the burning verses of Danté, Savonarola's eloquence, Galileo's discoveries, Boccaccio's wit, and Rienzi's devotion; by the patient statesmanship which culminated in Cavour, and by the popular demand embodied in such men as Garibaldi and Mazzini. Macaulay, surveying the four great movements made against the Pontifical supremacy, almost confessed to a doubt whether the Papal throne would ever be overturned. Yet since his time events have so rapidly ripened, that what he scarcely dared to hope is now realized. Henceforward the Pope, except in the honorary privileges still reserved to him, is none other than the chief pastor of the Roman Catholic Communion. That subtle, dogged, and desperately-defended axiom, fortified with the *non possumus*, and proclaimed as part of the Infallibility lately assumed by the Pontiff of Rome, is overwhelmed by force of facts. The incongruous union of the priestly and the political power has vanished, and humanity welcomes a result from which religion and freedom will date the commencement of a new and glorious calendar."

France, then, maintained the temporal power by an unrighteous occupation of Rome, and France has destroyed that power by undertaking the present unrighteous war. Nor will this war end without other results unfavourable to Papal influence. Ultramontane reaction was over-running France, and Jesuit power was silently covering the ground. The Emperor could not avert it, and before the war the warning voice had cried aloud, saying—"It is probable that the 'Company of Jesus' has never enjoyed so great prosperity as at the present time. More than a third part of a society which embraces the world in its operations, is occupied with the efforts to revive religion in France. Owing to their activity for the last ten years, their maxims prevail more and more in all seminaries of learning, the number of the secular priests is almost redoubled, there is not a rural parish which has not one or more of its acolytes; everywhere churches and oratories are constructed, and everywhere the education of infants and the distribution of Christian alms is intrusted to the monastic orders. Never were there reports of so many miracles; never were there so many demands for new canonizations, so many relics and pilgrimages! Formerly the cross was the chosen emblem of the Church of France, but now the Madonna is everywhere substituted in its place, and the cities hasten to place themselves, with eager rivalry, under her protection. The clergy, a short time ago, upon *Puy de Dome*, the central point of France, erected a colossal statue of the virgin, as protectress of the whole empire. If the Jesuits, and the clergy form the staff of the army of faith, the society of St. Vincent de Paul and the associations of women constitute the *valets* and the soldiers. By what means a beneficent society, founded for the purpose of distributing

bread and clothing to the poor, has been able to become the first power in the State—that which distributes magistracies and orders—is a thing which can be explained only by the Jesuits. Formerly the company reigned by means of the intrigues of courts; to-day its genius, fertile in expedients, has known how to find immense power in pious associations. By the side of the subtle and tenacious nets in which it knows how to involve whole provinces, and the means of corruption and intimidation which it possesses, the revolutionary affiliations of which we have heard so much are but childish devices. In some departments, from the Prefect to the *Maire* of the most distant commune, all the political functionaries belong to the society, and the municipal counsellors—those of the council and of the prefecture—are affiliated; and thus local employments and favours are granted to the creatures of the society; and unless Paris and some of the great cities, and a part of the central administration, had resisted this current, the entire government would soon have been in the hands of this celebrated society."

What shall be the condition of France when the Prussians are no more in the land, we shall not attempt to foretell. But this much is certain, that the Jesuit power must be, and is already, greatly broken. We look for days of liberty, when truth and falsehood shall be allowed to grapple on fair conditions, and then we fear neither the priest nor the infidel.

Nor are we without hope that this fearful war will prove a war of pacification. Nations are learning from it as they never were able to learn from previous military struggles. When peoples are wise kings will not be allowed to fight, unless they please to do so single-handed, without committing their subjects to the results. Either immediately out of this war, or if not, yet greatly hastened thereby, we expect the High Court of Nations for the settlement of national disputes, and consequently the hanging up of the sword as the sign of a barbarous and abandoned past.

THE ROMAN PLEBISCITE.

THE experiment of the plébiscité at Rome has proved an extraordinary success. It has elicited one of the most remarkable manifestations of public opinion which has ever been witnessed. The confidence with which the appeal was made to the Roman people is now fully justified. They have by an overwhelming majority declared their approval of the change. The preponderance of numbers is so great that we can well imagine the surprise with which diplomatists have read the record of the national will. They are bewildered by the glare of the political light which has so suddenly flashed upon them. The voting stands thus: for the abolition of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope and the consolidation of the Kingdom of Italy, with Rome for its capital, 40,000; for the retention of the old Papal regime, 68. It is an astounding contrast. The election proceeded with exemplary order and propriety. There was no disturbance or excitement. There was evidently no attempt to overawe the multitude, but they went to the urns with alacrity and enthusiasm. Bands of music paraded the streets, and at night the city was illuminated. Here was the popular feeling declared in the most demonstrative form. Not the least significant circumstance was the affirmative vote of some of the priests. This is the response given by Roman people to the ravings of the partizans of the Pope in this and other countries. The fanatical zeal which would arm Christendom in a crusade against the Italian Government receives a merited rebuke in this spontaneous expression of the will of the Roman people. They have long desired to be allowed to settle their own affairs, but, with glaring inconsistency, the advocates of "home rule" in Ireland deny to the Romans the privilege which they claim for themselves, and are ready to force upon the citizens of Rome a yoke which they feel to be oppressive, and would long since have cast off had it not been sustained by foreign bayonets. At length the opportunity was presented, and they eagerly embraced it, and now, at length, they have crowned the great work of Italian unity and progress.—*Express*.

EUREKA COLLEGE.

BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS BY PRES. EVEREST.

THE Bible is a book of principles, chiefly, rather than specific commands. It teaches by example as well as precept. What, therefore, was enjoined upon this particular man is, in a very important and true sense, enjoined upon all. When any modern Saul, brought up at the feet of some modern Gamaliel, clad in the bright armour of youth and skilled in the learning of his times, shall be arrested in his career; when the light of God's truth, shining above the brightness of the sun, shall reveal to him the meaning of life in its relations to time and eternity; and when feeling himself blind hitherto to the grandeur of human existence, he shall from the knees of prayer utter this importunate cry, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" then the Master would say to this one also, "Be thou a minister and a witness of my truth. Go thou unto men, open their eyes, turn them from darkness unto light, and from the power of Satan unto God." Saul was to accomplish his mission by preaching the Gospel as an apostle of Christ; we are to accomplish ours, some of us, by preaching the same Gospel, and others by an equally specific though different avocation. And each of us, standing among the lengthening shadows of life's day, and looking back on the vanished hours, should be able to say, "I have finished *my* course, I have kept the faith."

If the substance of this command is worthy of the Divine conception, the language is equally worthy of Divine utterance. "Turn them from darkness to light." Darkness is sorrow and death, but "truly the light is sweet, and a pleasant thing it is to behold the sun." The shadow of death hovers over the grave and Hades, but Heaven is a world of light. God dwelleth in the light; *God is light*. Beautiful as the light may be, yet science will not permit us to regard it as mere sunshine. It is the swift-winged messenger of Heaven, flashing intelligence from star to star. It is the quivering of that omnipotence which causes and accompanies the on-going of the universe. It is a condition and result of the life principle which gleams in leaf and flower, and thrills the being of men and angels. It is most fitly used, therefore, to symbolize truth. What the one is to the eye the other is to the soul. As the solar light is one, but many hued when spread out on the dark undulating banner of the storm, so in its highest generalization, all truth is one, but rainbow-coloured in its myriad manifestations; and as God said to the chaotic world, "Let light be," so has he said to the moral world, "Let truth be." Man is represented in this passage as standing in the evening twilight. The solemn and voiceless night is descending upon mountain and valley. The traveller, with drooping eyes and weary feet, is groping amid the shadows for the couch of his long rest in the grave. God would turn the soul from all this darkness to the light. He would have man stand in the morning twilight, where night is fleeing away and the day is bursting in. As the sun rejoices as a strong man to run a race, and mounts the sky to his meridian splendour, so does God command the human soul to gird itself with strength, and mount on wings of light to a destiny high and glorious.

But not more beautiful is the imagery of this language, than is its sound and far reaching philosophy. What is the true end of human existence? Any theory of morals which chains man to the rotten carcass of selfishness, to the murdered corpse of self-love, whether its avowed aim be spiritual worthiness, or worthlessness; whether it be this-worldliness or the other-worldliness, is essentially vicious. It leaves the soul in the gall

of bitterness and the bond of iniquity. The end of the law is love, or benevolence, out of a pure heart, and of a conscience unfeigned. Thus saith the Lord. Though ungodly men may denominate it a sickly sentimentalism—this doing good—yet, “thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,” is the royal law, is the Amazon of ethical philosophy which receives all the minor currents of duty, and flows on till it mingles its waters with the ocean of Divine benevolence. Further, how can we more perfectly fulfil this royal law than by turning men from darkness to light? What man needs is light; not nostrums for the body or mind; not law, and courts, and prisons; light, and not armies and war-ruined countries. Let but the sun of righteousness arise on heathen lands, and the foul and ravenous hyenas of ignorance and crime will skulk and hide in their dens. Man has too much of the mule to be made virtuous by flagellations. The fluttering newspaper is mightier then the belching columbiad.

From one point of view, indeed, this going forth to turn men from darkness to light, seems to savour of arrogance and egotism; but it is only seeming. The command to let our light shine is universal. The duties of giving and receiving are reciprocal. The light pours down from the sun in a grand and ceaseless flood; then every atom of air, every grain of sand, every particle of mist, every leaf and flower and glancing wing and quivering dewdrop, catching these myriad rays in their tiny hands, hurl them like shuttles of silver, every-whither, till all the air and sky is one broad web of glorious light. So does God pour down the light of His truth, so does He bid every conscious soul both receive and reflect it, till the night shall be no more.

In the discussion of this subject I shall enquire what this work is? how it is to be done? and why it should be done? This turning men from darkness to light implies, *first*, that we shall turn them *to the light of true science*. There is still much vulgar prejudice against learning. It is supposed to be ornamental rather than practical; to make men proud, conceited, and visionary; to be antichristian, or, at best of little account, since a man *can* read his bible and get to Heaven without much education. This prejudice arises, partly, from the influence of Roman Catholicism, which is throned in ignorance and superstition; partly, from the fact that many names renowned in science are on the side of infidelity; and partly, because science, falsely so-called, is opposed to the onward march of Christian truth. That the promotion of science is included in the commission of the men of God is evident from many considerations. He who marks the sparrow's fall and hears the callow raven's cry is not indifferent to man's condition, even in this life. The theory of some men would seem to be that every soul must pass through purgatory, and that if it would escape eternal suffering in the next world, it must exhaust the pains of Hell in this. They wear about long-drawn, lugubrious countenances, and speak in grave-yard tones. But God would have Heaven begin on earth. He would have us enjoy foretastes not only of its spiritual blessings; but also of its material comforts. He who has ground the granite into soil, and who waters it from the clouds; who has carpeted the cool meadows with verdure and sprinkled them with buttercups and daisies, certainly rejoices at man's progress in subduing and replenishing the earth; certainly is pleased to see those blind Sampsons of nature, wind, water, fire and lightning, once worshipped as demons, now domesticated and steadily toiling in the workshops of men. Every hour's study, therefore, every discovery, every invention and every successful enterprise, which betters man's physical condition, has the approbation of Heaven.

A decisive argument is found in the religious bearings of science. Nature and the Bible have the same author. They both present the perfect and sublime thoughts and plans of God, the very thinking of which will tend to bring the soul into sympathy with all truth. If looking upon nature with a poet's eye we exclaim, "What is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visitest him!" how much higher would our adoration rise if we saw nature in the light of science; saw, not only the stars in heaven's unpillared dome, but also their physical constitutions and mathematical relations; saw, not the ocean merely, but also its connection with history, climate, life and civilization!

Moreover, the contest eighteen centuries old, between Christians and those who reject our Lord Jesus Christ, has swept over and past the battleground of history and biblical criticism, and is now waxing hot on the fields of science. Every other religion goes down before the march of the ages; shall Christianity succumb? The following are some of the test problems employed: What is the origin and age of the earth? What is the age of the human race? Had man one or many centres of creation? What is the origin of species? Was Christ a supernatural being? What are the faculties of the human soul, and is Christianity adapted to them? Is the Christian religion such as to lead the van in the progress of civilization? Are the principles of the divine government as laid down in the Bible consonant with the laws of nature? Has the atonement its foundation in a true moral and governmental philosophy? Around these questions and many like them, do the waves of battle surge. No one can suitably discuss them who is not skilled in both science and theology. Christian men must study science. They must meet question with question, theory with theory, history with history, and fact with fact as stubborn. Proposition and proof must be homogeneous. You can not pray fossil reptiles and mastodons out of existence. If the atheist professes to have "sailed through the universe of worlds and found no maker thereof; to have descended into the abyss where being no longer casts its shadow, and felt only the rain drops trickle down, and seen only the gleaming rainbow of creation which originated from no sun, and heard only the everlasting storm which no one governs; and to have looked upward for the Divine eye and beheld only the black, bottomless, glaring, Death's eye-socket," we are to show him that it is his own heart that is black and bottomless, and that the fool has said in *his heart only*, "There is no God." If the materialist shall insist that mind is quicksilver or carbon, solid or gaseous; that the amount and quality thereof depends on a healthy digestion of the phosphates; and that thought is to be measured and compounded according to chemical laws, we must meet him not only with ridicule, but also with counter dogmatism and demonstration. If the idealist denies the existence of matter, then we must be able to follow him through his labyrinthine metaphysics, and show his sophistry and that his doctrine annihilates himself and his philosophy.

Not only does science serve for the defence of religion. It furnishes, in an equal degree, facilities for its propagation. It were trite to show how the steam engine and the ten thousand labour-saving machines lift from man's shoulders the burden of toil, adding cubits to his stature and years to his life; how the printing-press can preach more sermons in an hour than all the apostles in all their lives; how the steamship and flying train can carry these sermons, in an amazingly short time, to the ends of the earth. We have but to imagine ourselves living in the first century, and to mark how toilsome was the transcription of the sacred oracles, and that

while Paul was visiting a few churches in Asia Minor, a modern evangelist could make the tour of the world, to see how much Christianity is profited by the advancement of art and science.

Secondly, this mission implies the turning of men to the light of a true social philosophy. In this respect the nations are only in the twilight succeeding the Dark Ages. Are not immense standing armies still maintained at enormous expense? Consequently, as when every citizen carries his revolver, are not the nations easily exasperated to blood, and does not the tornado of war frequently sweep over earth's fairest fields? Do not the enslaved masses still heap up wealth to be lavished on dissolute royal families and licentious courts? Can it be that even in this country, the rights of the people, and the nature and province of law, are well understood when municipal and State governments license the nefarious traffic in alcoholic poisons, thus bartering, for so much blood-dripping gold, the lives of individuals, the peace of families, and the safety of the nation? Does not the great sewer of licentiousness flow on through society, finding no sea where its pollution is lost, but always returning upon itself? These are evils which demand the light of a true social science, the light of Christianity. If God *has* made "of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth;" if there is a brotherhood of man, and a fatherhood of God, then to open the eyes of oppressed millions, that they may see their wrongs, and become conscious of the strength to right them, then to turn society from the midnight of crime to the light of pure Christian principles, is an important part of this divine commission.

Thirdly, and specifically, however, this command requires that we shall turn men from the darkness of sin to the light of the Gospel. That this duty subordinates every other, to the believer in revelation, is axiomatic. If there is a God; if the soul is more valuable than the whole world besides; if it is to possess an immortality of bliss and progress in Heaven, or of suffering in Hell; if human sin is a fact; if the Son of God tasted death for every man; if Jesus, the Christ, is Lord of lords, and King of kings; and if man *can* do anything to save his fellow man, then to induce men to obey the Gospel should be the great concern of this life. Not till we shall regard the Bible as an old wives' fable, and Jesus as an impostor; not till we shall adopt the Epicurean motto, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," can we free our consciences from this responsibility.

This command to turn men from darkness to light, is seen, therefore, to be exceedingly broad, including our relations to nature, to man, to God. It is reasonable as well as Scriptural. The other positions are that man should do nothing, or should live to increase the darkness, both of which are absurd. On this rock, then, let us take our stand; here, on this mountain summit which lifts us far above the clouds into the clear sunlight of duty; here, where the voice coming from the excellent glory bids us hear and imitate the Perfect One.

Turn we now to our second question, *How shall this duty be performed?*

First, by our own direct and personal efforts. This may be the object of our profession, as in the case of teachers, ministers and authors; or it may be subordinate to our trade or business, a thread of gold running through the web of meaner uses, the flashings of light as we wield the sledge in the flinty quarries of life. In whatever a Christian man may engage, be it private or public, be it personal or official, he will have the same warm heart and divine purpose; he will be instant in season and out of season; he will stand up for God, and truth, and human souls; and he will do this, however feeble the apparent results however many and great

his discouragements. Notwithstanding Satan's splendid offer, Christ did not sell out. He was faithful to his mission despite opposition and ingratitude. Hatred could not engender hatred in his compassionate heart. He was cramped by no party creeds, and stultified by no Jewish prejudice, while his magnanimity was equalled only by his faith in God. If a man will stand for the truth, he may, in like manner, expect that the devil will lead him into the wilderness to starve and tempt him; that the missiles of opposition will hurtle about him; and that a pack of curs, in full cry, will yelp and snarl at his heels. Still, let him keep right on, nor threaten to leave the world in disgust. In patience he should possess his soul, enduring hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ, and believing

"That truth shall conquer at the last;
For round and round we run,
And ever the right comes uppermost,
And ever is justice done."

Secondly, this duty may be partially discharged by encouraging our fellow-labourers in this great work. Instead of antagonism and rivalry, Christianity would substitute union and co-operation. These should characterize the promoters of education and religion. Our college and university boards of education and all church organization should regard each other in this light, and, within the limits of conscience, be mutually helpful in this age of union among the workers of iniquity, when rum-manufacturers and rum-sellers, infidels and heretics, public and private thieves and corrupters of society of every grade, are marshalling under the black banner of Satan, it is high time that we were massing and consolidating our columns for the coming battle.

Again, we may turn men from darkness to light by the acquisition and right use of property. The relation between man and wealth is not necessarily sinful. Man has need of capital. The desire for wealth is God-given. In any free state of society, if a person is industrious and frugal, he can hardly avoid the accumulation of property. If all this is wrong, something has been misarranged. No, money is consolidated labour merely, and neither good nor evil in itself. How ought it to be used? this is the only question. Man, in this matter, is a co-worker with God. Man casts the seed into the furrow; God gives rain and sunshine. Man does a little, but God gives the increase. The result of all this human and Divine labour is a fortune. Now, to whom does it belong? Would not a just division give the Divine partner the larger share? True, man, as a steward, has control of it for a time, but if he spends it on his own lusts does he not rob God? and must he not give account of his stewardship in the Day of Judgment? There may be a miserly enjoyment in getting and keeping money, and a sinful pleasure in spending it on pride and ostentation, but who will not admit that there is vastly more pleasure, and that pure and lasting, in using wealth benevolently, and in living to enjoy the profits of the investment? Mr. Peabody is an illustrious example. He could have kept his millions. He could so have lived and died that the poor of London, the generations which shall throng the colleges of New England, and a whole race of men, should not rise up and call him blessed. He could have waited till death had unclasped his aged, twice-dead fingers, and set free his gold. Then, would both hemispheres have mourned his departure? Then, would his fame grow brighter and brighter as time wears away?

Whether a man has ten thousand or ten million, is he not equally responsible? Is not the widow who gives her two mites, her all, as noble, as munificent as a Peabody! Why should a man so live that his relatives

gathering about his couch of pain, in sorrow to be sure, would still have him go on with his dying? So live that the world will be glad when his carcass no longer dams up the stream of progress?

The custom, so prevalent, of leaving all one's property to his children is, at least, questionable. If children are educated and virtuous, if they have been trained into habits of industry and economy, they will need no better fortune than the example of noble parents. If they are idle and vicious, then property left them is a curse. Integrity, self-helpfulness and self-reliance are the best possible outfit.

Manifold are the ways in which gold can be hammered out into a grand reflector, by which a noble life, as it recedes among the bygone years, may still throw a heavenly radiance on man's darkened pathway. Educate the orphan, send abroad the missionary, build the Church. There is no benevolence, however, productive of greater and more lasting good, than the founding of Christian institutions of learning. Your ten thousand will gather to itself a hundred thousand more, bestowed by those who will be influenced by your example. You will not merely give a cup of water to the thirsty traveller; you will open a fountain, rather, which will flow on forever. Would you increase the light of science? How can you do it better than by providing that it shall be perpetually studied and taught? Do you pray for the progress of society, and the preservation of our nation? How can you ensure an answer to your petition more certainly than by bringing the means of acquiring a Christian education within the reach of every person? Would you hasten the time when all the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord? How can you do more to bring on this millennial age than by assisting to send forth thousands, of whom it is written, "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace, that publisheth salvation?" Though dead, would you still speak for Christ? Then provide by your benefactions that a score of men, fully panoplied, shall annually go forth to fight the battles of the Lord. Using your wealth for these highest ends, you will thus erect over your grave a monument from which multitudes shall tearfully turn away, having gained diviner views of life, and greater courage for its conflicts.

Our third question, *Why should we turn men from darkness to light?* needs but brief answer. The self-evident and conclusive reason is this: *Unless performed by Christian men, this work will not be performed at all.* There is a popular and unblushing assumption that the Church has always been the main obstacle to reform and progress. This assumption is as false as it is narrow and vulgar. What is the standing proof and illustration? Why, that the Roman Catholic Church commanded Galileo, under pain of imprisonment, to say that the earth does not move, but that he nobly dared to say in the teeth of this interdict, "*It does move*"—a statement involving more fiction than fact, and a very lean induction. The vandal who fired the Alexandrian Library, or the last ignoramus who said to his son, "I had no education, and you need none," were a stronger argument against the non-Christian world. The fact is just the contrary. The Christian religion has ever moved along the only bright path through the dark wilderness of time; a bright path for the same reason that the heavens are bright where moves the sun in his strength.

It furnishes the motive, eternal life, or eternal death, conditioned on the loyalty, the purity and the progress of this life; and the power, a sound mind in a sound body, and the material wealth, without which civilization is impossible. When the Roman Empire went down beneath the tide of

the northern barbarians, who met and conquered the invaders? The Church, corrupt as it was. Who kept burning the lights of ancient science and literature during the Dark Ages? The Church, ignorant as it was. Who received science and art in the sixteenth century? Christian men, than whom the world never saw purer or braver. Who, to-day, compose ninety-nine hundreds of those who found and conduct the colleges and universities of the world? Christian men, whose livery of Heaven infidels have stolen when they claim to be the sole promoters of science. Who elevate and give direction to all civilized governments? Who have carried the Bible and the arts which it creates and fosters into the dark abodes of barbarism, and to the far-away islands of the sea? What is the power which, for centuries, has been lifting the nations to higher and still higher planes of thought and life? The answer is evident, Christian men and Christian truth.

Upon the Christian Church, therefore, accepting this commission, conscious of its power, and possessing a large share of the world's wealth, has God devolved this immense responsibility.

INFALLIBILITY TROUBLE.

IN 1837, Bishop Purcell said on the question of the Pope's infallibility: "Appeals were lodged before the bishop of Rome, though he was not believed to be infallible. Neither is he now. No enlightened Catholic holds the Pope's infallibility to be an article of faith. I do not; and none of my brethren, that I know of, do. The Catholic believes the Pope, as a man, to be as liable to error as almost any other man in the universe. Man is man, and no man is infallible, either in doctrine or morals. Many of the Popes have sinned, and some of them have been bad men. I presume my worthy antagonist will take his brush in hand, and roll up his sleeves, and lay it on them hard and heavy; so will I; and whenever he uses a strong epithet against them, I will use a stonger."—*Debate with A. Campbell*, p 23.

Farther on, he said:

"We are not slaves in the Catholic Church. We are as free and untrammelled as any people under heaven. It is not the man, but the authority we respect. The man may err, and if the Pope claims a power not belonging to him, we soon remind him of his mistake. How this lesson has been taught to a few Popes, the history of the Church will show."

—*Ibid.* pp. 31, 32.

Again he said:

"I have no special apology to offer for a Pope who is a bad man. He should be the pattern of the flock from the heart. He should be the salt of the earth—the light of the world. He should remember that the 'mighty shall be mightily tormented'; and that 'a most severe judgment shall be for them that bear rule, if they walk not according to the law.' I should not be surprised if these bad Popes were at this moment expiating their crimes in the penal fires of hell."—*Ib.* p. 145.

On p. 154 he admits that of the last fifty Popes, but one had been a saint!

True to these convictions, the Archbishop went to the Ecumenical Council determined to oppose the dogma of the Pope's infallibility, and, from all accounts, did right valiant service against it. He not only spoke bravely in the Council against it, but joined Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, in behalf of several American Bishops, in opposition to the

Archbishop of Baltimore, and in defence of Bishop Dupanloup. In their joint letter they say :

"The American prelates have especial reason to hesitate upon the question of Pontifical infallibility. Neither Catholics nor Protestants in our country admit that the Popes have the right to depose sovereigns, to release subjects from their oath of allegiance, and to transfer when they please the kingdom of one Prince to another. Our citizens of Irish nativity, who are the majority and chief support of the Catholic Church in the United States, will have much difficulty—*de la peine*—in admitting that Pope Adrian IV., who was an Englishman, was infallible when he gave Ireland to Henry II, King of England; on the other hand, the Bulls of the Popes upon this subject are so clear and positive that the defenders of Pontifical infallibility in general, believe themselves forced to admit the temporal sovereignty of the Pope over the universe. Adrian IV. said most especially: [*'Adequus (Romanae ecclesiae) ius eam insulam, aliasque omnes quæ documenta fidei cepissent pertinere nemini dubium esset'*—To which—the Roman Church—belong that island and all others which have received the faith, as no one will ever doubt.]

That donation of Adrian IV. was confirmed by his successor, Alexander III. It is also remarkable that the modern authors who speak so high—*parlent si haut*—of the privilege of Pontifical infallibility, preserve at present a profound silence upon the other privilege, which their predecessors estimated as important, and as well proven. Until now we have been permitted to say that the Catholic Church has nothing to do with these transactions, and that it is not responsible for all that the Popes have done, or may do. But if these Pontifical decisions become articles of faith the Archbishop of Baltimore will be placed in an embarrassing position. * * Many of us believe that ecclesiastical history, the history of the Popes, the history of the Councils and tradition of the Church are not in harmony with the new dogma, and that is why we believe that it is very inopportune to wish to define as an article of faith an opinion which appears to us to lack any solid foundation in scripture and tradition—*dans l'écriture et la tradition*—while it is contradicted by many irrefragable monuments. It would be out of place to continue any longer a discussion which is the business of the Council; but before concluding we cannot refrain from expressing our profound regret that the friends so devoted in appearance to the Holy See, have raised by their indiscreet zeal many painful questions where religion has nothing to gain."

It seems utterly incredible that a man whose ripe scholarship compels him to make such admissions—who gives his maturest judgment that this doctrine of infallibility "lacks any solid foundation in Scripture and tradition, while it is contradicted by many irrefragable monuments,"—should against all Scripture, all tradition, and in the face of these monuments, give in his adhesion to a doctrine that he believes to be false, merely because of a majority of votes in the council in its favour! Yet the Archbishop has done so, and stands to-day an avowed adherent of what he has all along declared to be a false doctrine. It will be curious to trace the course of reasoning by which he is thus enabled to eat his own words, and deny his own convictions in obedience to a bare majority of that Council—a mere numerical majority; for we believe no one contends that the weight of learning and piety was found on the side of that majority.

Having examined the Archbishop's record up to 1870, and found him, even at the Council, the staunch opposer of Infallibility, declaring

deliberately over his own signature that "ecclesiastical history, the history of the popes, the history of the councils, and traditions of the Church, are not in harmony with the new dogma," and that it was "very inopportune to wish to define as an article of faith an *opinion* which appears to us to lack any foundation in Scripture and tradition, whilst it is contradicted by many irrefragable monuments; we notice his speech at Mozart Hall, Cincinnati, in which he accepts as true, that which the study of his whole life had led him to regard as contrary to Scripture, Tradition, Ecclesiastical History, and many irrefragable monuments." In this speech he gives us the following description of the last Ecumenical Council:

"The Council was composed—I have the list here—of 975 Bishops, Generals of religious orders, and Abbots. Besides these there were eleven Patriarchs, and then fifty-one Cardinals. You see what a large assembly it was, and what a full representation of the East and west, North and South, of kingdoms, and states, and territories, and out-of-the-way places, such as had never assembled in a Council before; because as you know, there was not a single Bishop from America in any former Council. This was a full and fair representation of Christendom."

This makes 1,037 members. Farther along the Archbishop says: "There were upwards of 530 in the Council who thought with the Pope, that he was and is infallible." This was only a majority of 23 in that large assembly. In the vote of July 13, there were but 451 that voted *placet*—an actual minority of the whole Council. On July 18 they run it up to 533, by the votes of those who had previously voted *placet juxta modum*, and who did not wish to give an unqualified assent to the dogma of infallibility. Even with these it is but a majority of 26 of the whole number of members! The real majority of *those present and voting*, July 13, is 150. Now it becomes a grave question, as to all the members of the Council save the 533, *whether the Holy Spirit guided them in their course*. If so, is it Holy Spirit against Holy Spirit—the Spirit directing votes against himself? If not, by what means was it known that the Spirit guided the majority rather than the minority? It is universally conceded that so far as learning, culture and piety are concerned, the weight is decidedly on the side of the minority. Are we to believe that all these were destitute of the guidance of the Holy Spirit? We have not by us, at this moment, the proceedings of the Council of Trent; but our recollection is that mere majorities did not count for much; and that where it was apparent that measures could be carried only by majorities, a change was adopted to secure unanimity. Yet here, in the gravest question ever acted on in Council—a dogma which, a few years ago, scarcely anyone could be found to affirm, and against which the array of learning and influence in the Council was tremendous, it is accepted as a decision of the Holy Ghost on the vote of a *minority of all the members*, in the first place, and a bare majority of 26 of the whole Council at best! The fact that a man like Archbishop Purcell, can be persuaded against all his convictions of truth and fact, to ignore his own manhood, vacate his throne of judgment, shut his eyes against the light of all history, and bow before the decision of *such* a majority, shows how abject is the prostration of soul in that tyrannous ecclesiasticism, and warns us that when men of learning can proceed to this extent of self-abnegation, we have nothing to hope for from the masses of Catholics, but blind adherence to the Pope's commands.

But what are we to think of a system which thus crushes out all independence and manliness?

We are indebted to the *Christian Standard* for the foregoing, as also for the following reading of the *Light Brigade*, by Dr. Adams.

“Over sea, over land,
Many leagues onward,
All to the Vatican
Went the FIVE HUNDRED.
Left their confessionals,
Took their canonicals—
Onward, man after man,
Went the FIVE HUNDRED.

Forward, the Robed Brigade,
Earnest, not undismayed;
Nono has thundered;
Not theirs to make reply,
Not theirs to reason “Why?”
Theirs but to go or die—
From their SEES sundered.

CANON—To right of them,
CANON—To left of them,
CANON—To back of them—
Nono has thundered:
“Vote me INFALLIBLE!
Else are ye doomed to hell,
Fire purgatorial,
All ye FIVE HUNDRED!”

Then flashed their crosiers bare—
Flashed round St. Peter's chair,
Flashed in Rome's tainted air—
Nono had thundered!
Each in canonical
Votes him Infallible—
Silken FIVE HUNDRED.

CANON—To right of them,
CANON—To left of them.
CANON—To back of them—
Thus the Pope thundered:
“Ye did your duty well;
All the rest fled or fell;
Back from the jaws of hell,
Come, ye FIVE HUNDRED!”

Came, what was left of them—
Honor not left to them;
Nobody wondered.
Let not their shame be hid,
For the false deed they did
When the Pope thundered!
Shame to the Robed Brigade!
Shame to their canon-aid!
Lying FIVE HUNDRED!

THE STATE CHURCH AND DISESTABLISHMENT.

Just before the late session of Parliament closed a notice was placed upon the Order Book of the House of Commons in the following terms :—

"Mr. Miall,—Church of England,—Committee of the whole House for the purpose of laying before it resolutions preliminary to the extension to the Church of England of the policy of disestablishment and disendowment carried into effect by the Irish Church Act of 1869."

Upon this notice the *Liberator* remarks :

"We do not anticipate that many objections will be offered to the time chosen for this important movement in advance : but it may be well to state the case in its favour, leaving to another occasion a reference to the duties which it involves.

Next to the fact that the Church of England has now been disestablished in Ireland, the strongest reason for aiming straight at the disestablishment in England, is, that if we go forward at all, that is almost the only direction in which we *can* go. Of what are termed "practical questions," so few are now left, that it would require much ingenuity to make them the basis of future operations. University Tests have now got beyond the position of a Dissenter's grievance question, and the opening of the churchyards to Dissenting ministers is a theme which does little to excite thought or to kindle enthusiasm. Other questions of detail are, most of them, so related to the main question, that, to deal with them without touching it would be beginning at the wrong end.

We need not trouble ourselves about our supposed relations with the Government, as an element in the decision of such a question ; for any hesitation on our part will be more embarrassing to ourselves than decisive action would be embarrassing to them. Whatever may be Mr. GLADSTONE's own views, his Government has already made its declaration of policy, in the debate on the motion on the Church in Wales. Now that the Irish Establishment has gone, it announces itself to be pro-establishment, and Mr. GLADSTONE's reply to Mr. MIALl cannot be more resolute than his reply to Mr. WATKIN WILLIAMS, though, we expect, he will find it much more difficult.

While no mere debates in Parliament will bring the great question to an issue, the value of a good debate in the early stages of a struggle is unquestionable ; and though the Liberation party has not, we hope, reached the acme of its strength in the House of Commons, it is better represented in the present House of Commons than it has ever been, and we may wait a long time before we have leaders who are abler, more trusted, and more respected, than we now happily possess. They are willing, as well as competent, and they have a good force around them, as well as a much greater force to sustain them from without.

"Of course you expect to be decisively defeated?" will be the comment of even those who assent to these statements. And, so far as the mere majority against the motion is concerned, we do expect it ; but we expect nothing in the shape of a fiasco, or of a defeat which will be, in any sense, either weakening or humiliating. We may make real progress while seemingly beaten back. We may even excite the astonishment, as well as secure the respect, of opponents, by a display of strength which they had not imagined us to possess.

Temporary failure, and even repeated failures, in Parliament are commonly the road-way to ultimate success ; and, as the process is inevitable, the sooner it is commenced the sooner it will be ended. If it stimulate our adversaries, it will also energise our own forces. It will check any reactionary feeling which may have grown out of recent success. It will gather round an abiding centre a mass of floating opinion, of the extent and precise direction of which we have now no precise knowledge. It will set thousands thinking, for the first time, on the merits of a controversy about which they have hitherto been indifferent, and it will make thinkers actors, and bring new recruits to our standard.

The extent to which the discussion of next session will effect these objects will, however, depend upon exertions which must not be delayed till next February, and of these we can best speak in another issue."

On these preliminary exertions we hope to speak in time to influence our readers to do what in them lies. We, of all people, ought not to be quiet spectators in this struggle. But, shall those who read this writing see England without a State Church? Yes! unless, in the providence of God, they are called away early to rest. Events march quickly in these days. If the pressure from without does not speedily place the English Church on a level with its sister of the Emerald Isle, the demands from

within will compel it to take that position. An influential and increasing party within its walls desire that result, and are preparing to organize in order to secure it; while another growing section, who do not desire it but hold it as inevitable, not only offer no opposition, but deem it better to facilitate it on the best terms. As indications of this see the following from "Churchmen" and Church Papers:—

THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE.

A correspondent of the *Church Review* writing in reference to the Communion Service in Westminster Abbey, advocates in vigorous language the separation of the Church from the State:—"Things cannot go on as they are. Great changes are impending. If the Church does not soon awaken to the sense of her true position, and demand her freedom from the trammels of the State, her chains will be rivetted, and she will be made by Act of Parliament a department of the State. The political appointment of the bishops lies at the root of the evil that has made sad the hearts of those whom the Lord has not made sad, and has strengthened the hands of the wicked. Surely the time has come for the Church to take the initiative, and petition for separation from the State on the same terms as those lately accorded to the disestablished Church in Ireland. What is wanted is combination and organisation on the part of Churchmen. Our proper leaders utterly failing us, are there none of note in the Church of the laity and the clergy, no true champions of the faith, to lift up the banner of the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Crucified founded upon a Rock, but planted in the sea? Are there none to lift it out of the mire in which its appointed guardians and defenders have done all in their power to trail it? Are there none to lift it up that the faithful may rally around it? Great as may be the evils and dangers attending disestablishment, they cannot be greater than those by which the Church is beset and threatened as now established and united to the State. If the union between Church and State is to continue, it is of no use shutting our eyes to the fact that the Church will be established by the State on what is called a broader basis, which means a more or less sweeping alteration of the formularies of the Church by Act of Parliament. Surely the evils attending separation from the State are not worthy to be compared with evils such as these. If they are to be averted, everything, under God, depends upon Churchmen showing themselves alive to the crisis and ready for the emergency. Let them unite, laity and clergy alike, in petitioning for instant and complete separation from the State on the same conditions as those granted to the Church in Ireland, and the blessing of Almighty God will rest upon his Church and faithful people, and the land shall be blessed for their sake."

THE ALTERNATIVE SUPPORTED.

In reply to this, another correspondent writes:—"I cannot but think the time has come when the choice between the evils of Establishment and Disestablishment must be made by us. The evils we have experience of, no doubt, always appear the greatest, but, on the other hand, the evils which mankind most dread are those which involve self-sacrifice. In spite of this, the feeling among Churchmen for disestablishment is rapidly gaining ground, and the Westminster scandal has done more to develop it than the Temple business. Still there is much natural hesitation in undertaking so momentous a responsibility—we want leaders. I do not think that the E. O. U. in fairness to its members could declare even now a separation of Church and State; but might it not test the feeling of Churchmen by inviting names to be sent in with a view to forming some association of those who thought that the time for a separation had arrived, and that it had become the duty and wisdom of the Church herself to take the initiative? In the event of such an association being formed, I would venture to suggest, that whilst not neglecting to use the ordinary weapons of a carnal warfare, it should rely above all on spiritual weapons, seeking to ascertain the Lord's will and to follow His guidance in working out our deliverance.

STRIKING THE RIGHT NOTE.

The *Church Review* in a leading article commenting upon the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, says:—"It is a serious reflection that perhaps there is no one who does not feel that there is less chance in 1870 of abolishing the Exchequer Court of Appeal than there was in 1850. The inference from this is, that if twenty years of progress, which have done so much in spiritualising the Church, have had the effect of alienating the State, the spread of religious life must end in complete alienation."

NO ESTABLISHMENTARIANS LEFT.

"It can hardly be said that anybody belongs to the Church now-a-days because it is an Establishment. A few dozen dignitaries who have a well-grounded persuasion that but for 'the union of Church and State' the good things which they enjoy would not have fallen into their lap—a small section of worldlings whose profession is a mere conventionalism may possibly deserve the name of Establishmentarians; but all those to whom Churchmanship is a religion—all who give themselves, their time, or their money, to extend the Faith, to make manifest the beauty of holiness, or to civilise and christianise the masses—do it distinctly as members of the Anglican Church, or, if you prefer the term, sect."—*Church Times*.

AN EPISCOPAL OPINION.

"It was no part of his duty to express an opinion upon the measure that had brought about the disestablishment of the Church in Ireland. It had, however, a most important bearing upon the future of the Established Church in England. No person could doubt that the same principles which had led to one result, were capable of being applied with considerable force to another case of a similar kind. Dissent in England held a position not altogether without analogy to Roman Catholicism in Ireland; and it could not be doubted that there was a large number of persons, who on different grounds—religious, political, or philosophical—were most eager and anxious that measures of the same kind as those taken in Ireland, or less considerate ones, should be adopted in England. The attack, indeed, had already begun, and unfortunately there were diversities of opinion amongst the defenders that were highly embarrassing."—*Charge of the Bishop of Salisbury*.

DISESTABLISHMENT THE ONLY REMEDY.

The Rev. J. Slater, of Southampton, preached, on August 28th, a sermon from the text,—"Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, nor cast ye your pearls before swine." Referring to what has been called the "Westminster scandal," Mr. Slater said,—

"But you ask—What are we to do? Where lies our remedy? I answer, in the severance of the Church from State-Control; and I exhort you, as you value your Church—as you value your own souls, rest not day or night till you have seen that severance brought about. In a free Church such a sacrifice as this would be simply impossible. Why? Because we should have discipline. As things are now, a man says—'I am an Englishman: the national Church is partly mine. I have a right, therefore, on national Grounds, to partake of the national altar.' In a free Church, a man could only say—'I am a communicant. I have satisfied my Church as to my fitness to go to communion; I therefore present myself at the altar.' Our present position makes us the bye-word of our neighbours, as well as the whole world. The Church of Rome and the Church of the East allow no one to go to communion without previous confession. I am informed that no sect of Dissenters permits its people to partake of the ordinance without previous preparation and examination. The Church of England gives communion to anybody who wishes it, and this simply because she is the Church by law established. My brethren, these things must not, they cannot be."

CHURCH AUTHORITY AND DISESTABLISHMENT.

If all Church authority, as now administered, fail us, men who have been steadfastly opposed to disestablishment will come to feel that the only chance of vindicating the distinctiveness of Church principles is to be sought, at all risks, in severing the connection with the State, and surrendering those external privileges, which have become the one ground of the claims which paralyse all discipline, and jeopard all truth.—*Rev. T. T. Carter in the Guardian*.

PREPARING MEN'S MINDS FOR DISESTABLISHMENT.

A correspondent of the *Church Review* writes as follows:—

"There may be a question whether the English Church Union could take the initiative in this matter; but why should not Churchmen, who are convinced that no good can come from the union between the Church and the State under present conditions and circumstances, be invited to send in their names to a certain person, or better still, to certain persons in different parts of the country, who should undertake to receive them privately. Provided they were men of known integrity, it would not much matter whether they were laymen or priests. The names would, of course, be given in confidence, on the distinct understanding that they should not be made public without the consent of those giving them. This would help to prepare men's minds for what must sooner or

later come, and at the same time, in a quiet unobtrusive way, test the feeling of Churchmen generally at the present moment, and bring them into possible communication with each other. May we not hope, or rather, ought we not firmly to believe, that a work so begun, and continued in simplicity and godly sincerity, would be sure to receive a blessing from Him from whom come all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works, and whose strength is made perfect in our weakness?"

Illustrations of this kind might be largely increased, but time and space cry, for the present, *Enough!* Let us *pray and labour*, and right speedily shall State-churchism, in the Kingdom of Great Britain, belong solely to the past and be found only upon the pages of history.

THE BAPTIST UNION.

THE Baptist Union held its Autumnal Session in Cambridge, late in September. Perhaps we are quite safe in saying that the subjects under notice gave an interest to the occasion superior to that of any former meeting. This fact accounts for our notice of its proceedings thus late. The Chairman (W. ROBINSON) having delivered an address, J. H. MILLARD (Secretary) read a message from the Committee, in which, first, reference was made to the fact that Cambridge had been selected for the meeting in the hope that the honours and emoluments of the English Universities would have been thrown open to the Dissenters.

The subject of University Tests was introduced by W. S. ALDIS, M.A., who gave a lucid explanation of the constitution of the Universities and Colleges, and moved the following resolution:—

"That in the opinion of this Union no settlement of the question of Tests in the National Universities will be complete or permanent which does not include, in addition to the provisions of the bill introduced last Session, the abolition of the necessity of taking Orders as a condition of acquiring, or holding any office or emolument in the National Universities, and the Colleges thereof respectively, and that this resolution be embodied in a memorial to her Majesty's Government, and signed by the Chairman on behalf of the Union."

The resolution was seconded by MR. NEVILLE GOODMAN, M.A., in a very vigorous address against the system of Tests. Mr. Goodman dwelt especially on the social influences of the system. He said:—

"More than this the social status of each one of you is affected by these Tests. I will not appeal to your passions, though I could do so; but I would ask you whether you have never heard it quietly assumed that Dissenters as a body were a low class of people, ill-bred, and ill-educated, unrefined and uncultivated? Has it never been taken for granted in your presence, and with but little regard to your feelings, that your ministers never could be considered on a social equality with the clergy of the Establishment? Pray in future ask the ground of this assumption. Ask if the Dissenting artisan is less careful of the education of his children than the Church-going agricultural labourer? Ask if the Dissenting shopkeeper is less aware that knowledge is power than his conforming neighbours? If your detractor insists on speaking of the higher classical education furnished by the Universities, ask him if it is fair thus to insult you in order that he may injure, and to injure you in order that he may insult you? I know that when public opinion is on our side, and the House of Lords on the other, it is only a question of sooner or later: but I will offer one or two considerations which will show that if you value your own influence it will not do to wait. 1. We have arrived at a time in the history of civilization when the pursuit of the higher branches of science are likely to occupy more attention than heretofore. I, for one, do not see the great advantages of civilization if it is but to give us more superfluous luxury. What is the use of our appliances for the economy of labour, or the facilities for accumulating national wealth, unless thereby we are unable to tell off from the body politic a number of our best disciplined minds, to form lines of speculative thought and scientific investigation? And if we have arrived at that stage in the history of civilization, as I trust we have, when, upon a broad foundation of material wealth, the superstructure of refinement in art, culture of the intellect, and the study of God's works, may be built, I feel sure that, in the pursuit of these ends, the greatest honours are to be won, and I am

anxious to secure, both for the benefit of the world and for my co-religionists, that they should have a free entry upon those fields of labour and of honour. 2. We have determined that the nation shall be educated, and we have also determined that we shall not dogmatise to the children of the poor in matters of religion. This great system of national education must be capped at its highest part by unsectarian Universities, or these Universities will henceforth be like the capitals of Grecian columns which the earthquake has thrown to the ground. We are doing our duty to ourselves and to our country, if we raise these fragments and place them in their right places. To accomplish these ends you have but to carry the last line of defence; but their lordships are quite masters of the position if you do not make the assault. I do not know how to read the lesson taught by our peers, who were content to swallow at a gulp the Irish Church Bill, with its long vista of consequences, and have again and again rejected this Universities Tests Bill, unless it be this: they are resolved to teach us that they will yield nothing to justice, but everything to fear."

The resolution was carried by acclamation.

At a subsequent period J. T. BROWN, of Northampton, moved the following resolutions on ecclesiastical affairs:—

"That this Union, having regard to the manner in which all questions affecting the principles of religious equality in this country were treated during the last Session of Parliament, resolves:—

1. "That this Union tenders its grateful thanks to HENRY RICHARD, Esq., and to those Members of Parliament who supported his motion on the Elementary Education Bill; to WATKIN WILLIAMS, Esq., and those Members of Parliament who supported his motion for the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Episcopal Church in Wales; and to EDWARD MIALI, Esq., for his proposed motion on the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Episcopal Church in England and Wales in the next Session of Parliament."

2. "That the Union regards with deep regret the increased facilities afforded, during the past Session, to sectarian education at the public expense, and strongly protests against the continuance of this anti-national system in the country, and its introduction into Ireland."

3. "That this Union records its satisfaction at the prospect of a discussion in Parliament of the question of the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Episcopal Church in England and Wales, and expresses the confident hope that MR. MIALI's motion will receive the hearty support of all the friends of religious equality."

4. "That the Union asks her Majesty's Government to extend to the whole of the United Kingdom the same measure of religious justice which they so happily conferred upon Ireland in 1869, and the principle of which has been adopted by nearly all the dependencies of Great Britain."

5. "That this Union calls upon all Nonconformists energetically to support those candidates for Parliament who will pledge themselves to sustain the principles of religious equality."

MR. BROWN said, he was quite sure that such resolutions would meet with a hearty reception at a meeting of Baptists—a denomination that had ever been foremost in the advocacy and maintenance of liberty, in its widest and purest form. At such a meeting, and in such a place, it was needless to enlarge upon resolutions in favour of religious liberty. He desired simply to remind his Nonconformist brethren that there would be required from them in the coming controversies a much more intelligent grasp of the certainty of their principles than they had ever had; a profounder conviction of their importance, as identified with the interests of mankind, and the interests of religion, together with a bolder policy than they were at present pursuing. Their voice should give forth no uncertain sound, but should be distinctly heard by the country, the House of Commons, and by the Prime Minister himself, as an expression of their determination to maintain, without faltering, and in every Christian way, the integrity of their principles. How had they been treated during the last Session? Look at the Education question, the question of University Tests, and the Burials Bill. Look at any ecclesiastical question, and see the way in which they had been treated. Even an enlightened man like Mr. Gladstone had charged them with being anti-national. The truth was that in all matters connected with

education and religion, they desired no favour themselves, and at the same time they were unwilling that others should be favoured. He believed in charity most thoroughly. He would embrace every one, and deal fairly towards his most bitter opponent, putting the most generous construction upon his motives. But it should be remembered that the Lord Jesus, as well as being the gentlest being on earth, was the boldest, and farther from nothing than from shifting policies and poor expediences."

These activities mean clearing the road for a fair conflict between truth and error. They mean a speedy realization of what Paul prayed for—that the word may have FREE COURSE and be glorified. And so shall it be!

MUSIC AND WORSHIP ; OR IDOLATRY IN MANCHESTER.

CERTAIN churches, devoted to restoring the primitive order of things, are suffering from commotion over the introduction of Instrumental Music. We mean churches in America, with which many of our readers are associated. The following, from a Manchester paper, may either serve for a model or a warning, as the parties concerned may incline to take it :—

"It may not be generally known that there is a place in Manchester where a decidedly idolatrous worship is conducted. A huge idol of wood, zinc, and brass is erected at one side of the temple, and to this monster, from the many mouths of which issue loud noises at intervals, the attention of the worshippers is mainly directed. Not to beat about the bush any longer, the temple is St. Peter's Church, and the idol a grand organ with four manuals.

As we approach the church for evening service, a figure appears to bar the way, whom we might take for St. Peter himself, so venerable is his appearance and so suspicious is his regard. We walk boldly forward, however, as one who has a right to enter those exclusive portals, and are soon in a pew, and the door closed upon us. The first idea is that the place is a music-hall, and that we ought to possess a sixpenny refreshment ticket—a notion to which the galleries in front of us and the one above it contribute. If the statues of the saints were replaced by studies of Venus, Hebe, and other lightly-clothed ladies, the illusion would be perfect ; but the conduct of the audience is decorous, and there is nothing to drink. We then conclude that the affair is more like one of Mr. Hallé's concerts, and that full dress would be the correct thing. The idol begins to sing gently, while the congregation move in and bang the doors. When the priest begins the usual notice to "the wicked man," it is evident that divine service is intended. The service is choral, performed by a select and small choir of ladies and gentlemen. It therefore seems that the organ would be of more use in the Free Trade Hall than here. The late arrivals continue to rattle the doors and make a noise precisely as their counterparts do at a fashionable concert.

The Psalms are chanted by the aforesaid choir to the prettiest and most florid of chants. These over, instead of the usual "Here beginneth," the parson comfortably seats himself, and the congregation do the same, all eyes being turned to the organ. Then the amateur who plays it (and he is a man of great taste) begins to show off the monster by means of a middle voluntary. He seems to say, "Just listen to these diapasons ; let me add this hautboy ; here's a sweet thing in cremonas ; now for the flute ;" the people meantime looking on in speechless admiration. The clergyman is evidently a second-rate person here, and is simply tolerated to give an excuse for the proceedings.

The great feature of the evening, however, is the anthem, during the singing of which the whole congregation sit. The anthem is one of old Dr. Nares', and a lady, with sweet voice and excellent execution, warbles the solo most charmingly. The greatest self-restraint has to be exercised to prevent us from applauding; the looks of the members of the congregation as they smile at each other with satisfaction take the place of applause. The music is of the delightfully old florid style, now considered so antiquated, but still charming everywhere, and not out of place even in an anthem, which is not intended to be congregational. The prayers being finished, a hymn is given out. It must be noted that, with the exception of a few wilful spirits, none of the congregation had hitherto taken any musical part; the singers had it all to themselves. We should have been very much surprised to have heard a Gregorian tone where everything was so pretty and so elegant and subdued. What, then, was our surprise when the organ gave out the melody of a tune now seldom heard out of the conventicle—a tune known as "Irish." Our astonishment was greater when the hitherto quiet congregation joined in, not hesitatingly, but with a perfect shout. Mr. Joule would not be beaten; he pulled out his stops; the spirit of the congregation was aroused; the shouting was louder; more stops; it might have been Mr. Spurgeon's Tabernacle. The effect was not unpleasant, the singing being very fair. Whether the congregation might not be educated to sing stricter tunes is a question we cannot discuss here; suffice it to say, this was sung with great power. At the Cathedral, in the afternoon, the congregation had sung the Old Hundredth almost as lustily.

The Sermon at St. Peter's was evidently considered an impertinence, and was concluded in ten minutes. Mysterious movements with vergers and some members of the congregation had been going on during the service, and metal plates had been handed about. There was a collection made, during which the choir again sang. Then the organ spoke in louder tones, to drown the noise of retreating footsteps. Strange that so few stayed to hear the voluntary! Perhaps they had had enough of their idol for once. We felt as if we had spent a pleasant evening, but hardly as if we had attended Divine Service. Were the reforming King Hezekiah churchwarden of St. Peter's, he would break up the grand organ, and call it Nehushtan."

Let each church be an Hezekiah, turn out the Nehushtan, walk in the good old ways, content itself with Apostolic preaching, and avoid the beginning of evils. Keep out the thin edge of the wedge, and it will never be driven home.

NOTICES OF SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS.

REPORTS of recent important Meetings are before us, including that of the British Association, at Liverpool, and the Social Science Congress, at Newcastle.

The meeting of the British Association for the advancement of Science was one of marked interest. Professor Huxley, as President, by his opening discourse gave a tone to the whole meeting, and the history that he supplied of the controversy on the Origin of Life will always, with all its imperfections, remain a valuable *resumé* of what has been said on the matter. One very marked imperfection was, the total ignoring of the speculations of Lamarck and Lord Monboddo, the experiments of

Mr. Crosse and Mr. Weekes, the expositions of the author of the *Vestiges of Creation*, and the replies of Hugh Miller and others. Another defect was, his blundering distinction between *belief* and *faith*. The learned Professor hesitated to say he *believed* in original *abiogenesis*, but said he had a *philosophical faith* in it, viz.: that life, in its humblest forms, was originally begotten in darkness, when the earth was going through its primeval physical and chemical changes. We would tell the Professor that faith is the stronger word; that there can be no faith without belief. Belief, however, may exist without faith. Faith is belief intensified into confidence. A more serious defect of the Professor, however, is, his totally ignoring the theory of creative power as the source of life. It is a theory held by many of large scientific attainments and of undoubted ability, and it suits all the facts hitherto observed. Again, his expression of faith above referred to is utterly unphilosophic. Not a single fact, on the doctor's own showing, is in favour of *abiogenesis*, yet he says that originally life had its abiogenetical origin. Now true philosophy requires that you shall have facts as the basis of theory, hence Dr. Huxley was setting a very unworthy example for so great a *savant*. It must be told that afterwards Dr. H. C. Bastian controverted Dr. Huxley's statements, and supported *abiogenesis* as a thing that had occurred under his own eyes, and in two numbers in *Nature* has replied at length to Huxley's inaugural discourse, and sums up his protest against it in six distinct *gravamina*, the first of which is that it is not characterized by "*due impartiality*." With this we agree, as above stated. Professor Tyndall took part in this discussion, and Dr. Frankland and others also had something to say; Tyndall's *germ* theory of disease being brought into it. Whether this latter theory be true or not, it promises to bear useful fruit in leading to a knowledge of the causes of epidemic diseases, Dr. Frankland stating that he had already arrived at certain distinctions between the breath of patients in scarlet fever and sufferers from small-pox. It was announced that one observer had succeeded in taking *photographs* of the human breath. Professor Tyndall gave an able discourse on the "Scientific use of the Imagination," which, however, would have been more correctly described as on the use of the imagination in science. Without referring to the phenomena of light which he so ably set forth, we can only observe that the use of the imagination that was deemed correct was that which enabled the observer of nature to realize and describe operations and effects which are invisible and unobservable, but which must exist as the ground work of results that are within the limits of our sensational experiences. The Professor, however, went out of his way to mis-apply this to the *evolution* theory of Charles Darwin, and by implication to justify the *faith* of Huxley, to which we have referred. Sir John Lubbock gave the substance of his recent volume on *Savages*, in a lecture to the working men of Liverpool, at the close of which the irrepressible Huxley stated some of his Australian experiences among the natives, and said that he had seen in Liverpool more *savages*—unwashed, unkempt—than at the antipodes, and started the great social problem of how to abolish the savagery which exists alongside our boasted civilization. Another paper on the American Indians and the possibility of civilizing them brought out some startling statements as to their decrease and the hindrances to their advancement. It is worth notice that our scientific men do not seem to seek the true reason of this. It is a fact that our home savagery is caused very largely by intoxicating drink, and the advancement of the red man and the black is hindered by the same accursed fire-water. This needs, not investigation, but action by all

ranks of society, and of Parliament. The addresses by the presidents of sections were all worthy of careful perusal, but our space prevents further comment, and we must therefore leave any notice of the numerous and able papers read, just observing that Sir H. Rawlinson's paper on *The site of Paradise* was considered as not quite in place at a meeting of the British Association.

The meeting at Newcastle seems to have been rather tame. The Duke, who presided, seemed not quite in harmony with the object of the Association, as he appeared to think there are limits to popular progress which it is not desirable to pass. But Dukes are not remarkable for care for their fellows. Questions relating to employer and employed were discussed, and statements with regard to Boards of Conciliation were submitted, that seem to indicate the beginning of a better state of things.

The Societies whose proceedings we have thus glanced at have one object: the amelioration of man's estate. And it is quite within our province to wish them well in their different departments, but we venture to suggest that a recognition of the *moral* nature of man, and his ability by that nature to control that which is physical only, would be of advantage to the *savans* of Liverpool, and that a desire to recognize the handiwork of God in His creation would not tend to make them less acute observers or able thinkers. We also suggest that it is not the opinions or dogmas of theologians that should be considered as the religious view of science, but just what the Scriptures say. Thus it was jocosely said at Manchester that the question of man's condition was, whether we are developed savages or degenerate angels. The scientific men say the former, and it is *assumed* that religious men believe the latter. But the Bible teaching is neither the one nor the other.

On the most interesting point in the foregoing an esteemed correspondent presents the following article:—

BIOGENESIS.

“Victorious along the whole line at the present day.” Such is the verdict of Doctor Huxley with reference to the theory involved in our title as opposed to the theory of *abiogenesis*, or spontaneous generation, in the speech at Liverpool (September 14th), in which he so ably discussed the history of theories of the *origin of life* that have been held by naturalists and chemists for several generations. This verdict of so eminent a *savant* as Professor Huxley is of very great importance, and from the known tendency of his thoughts, and the statements of his expectations on this subject in the same speech, it is precisely the verdict he would rather not have announced. Hence we must award him the praise of honesty which was tendered to him the same night by the Earl of Derby.

But Professor Huxley, as far as his opinions are known, is an unbeliever in revealed religion. Whether he would, like Byron or Shelley, write *atheos* to his name may be doubtful, but that his theism, if he has any, is more decided than that of the author of the *Vestiges of Creation* is not to be believed till he himself says it. The controversy, then, on the origin of life, and the development of species, which is akin to it and indeed part of it, is looked at by the Huxley school as much from a theological point of view as it would be by you, Mr. Editor, and certainly the establishment of the doctrine of spontaneous generation would be regarded by them as dead against the teaching of the Scriptures.

I purpose, then, in this article to show that the quotation from Huxley is so far a surrender of the battle-ground held for more than twenty years,

and that other statements in his speech are virtually a yielding of the new ground more recently taken up by the Darwinian hypothesis. We will first define the few technical terms we shall have to use, in the sense they were used by Dr. Huxley. *Biogenesis*, then, as a theory affirms that all life began from pre-existing life. *Abiogenesis* is the negative of that, viz.: that life has or had its origin in *non-living* matter, or was spontaneously generated by chemical combinations and physical conditions of matter. *Biogenesis* may be divided into *homogenesis* and *heterogenesis*; the former representing the ordinary condition of animals or plants, producing at once *like* animals or plants or, as in the case of insects, an intermediate form delaying the appearance of the *like* successor, while the latter term expresses the hypothesis that one form of life may beget *another* and distinct form from itself, that will remain permanently different from its ancestor. The term *heterogenesis*, however, having acquired a special meaning in another sense, Huxley substitutes for it *xenogenesis*, and I shall use this term, which only differs from the word it supplants by meaning a *foreign* beginning of life instead of *another*. In the infancy of experimental science, what is yet a local vulgar belief was not uncommonly accepted with reference to the origin of maggots in dead meat, viz.: the idea that they were spontaneously generated, and that we had in this a case of *abiogenesis*. This might also be assumed as a case of *xenogenesis*, the dead meat being considered as *organized* substance capable of giving rise to another form of life. It is now known, however, that the maggots are produced from the eggs laid by flies, hence it is a clear case of *homogenesis*.

Let it not be supposed that the discussion of such matters is useless, much less that it is impious. If the desire of the investigator be to find *truth* undoubtedly he will find some truth, and that truth will be useful some time or other. Thus experiments that have been supposed to bear much on the question before us have resulted in means being used successfully for stopping the ravages of a disease among silkworms which has largely interfered with the staple manufacture of the south of France. But the true bearing on religious belief it is not wise to shut our eyes to. The believer in the Bible holds that God made the worlds, and that in a very special manner He is the originator of life. That the external arrangements of nature are in the main for the support of life, and that human life especially is His care, as it is largely assimilated to His own Divine nature. That the support of life is not a thing beneath His *continued* notice, but that He specially originated it, and though His creatures may hew the rock or modify the plain into almost infinite diversity, yet they can only in well defined limits control or modify life. That each separate *species* of animals was *separately* created by God is not, indeed, stated in so many words in Scripture, but as it is stated of that *genus* (*homo*) of which there is but one species, it is not unnaturally assumed that such was the case. But the Darwinian theory of *development* is *xenogenesis*, viz.: that in given conditions an animal will give birth to another animal unlike itself, and that the *dissimilarity* may be intensified and perpetuated in succeeding generations, so that all the races of animals and plants may have originated in one or two primordial forms. Then going back to the period in geologic cycles when those primordial forms existed the question arises, How did *they* originate? And if the enquirer answers, that by physical laws non-living matter germinated and lo! there was life, without any Divine intervention, then we may eliminate God from our thoughts, and not even sigh for Him as does the author of the *Vestiges*.

Spontaneous generation, however, as an observed fact is not believed in by Professor Huxley, but it may be. These are his words, "With organic chemistry, molecular physics and physiology yet in their infancy and every day making prodigious strides, I think it would be the height of presumption for any man to say that the conditions under which matter assumes the properties we call 'vital' may not some day *be artificially brought together*." The italics are mine; they mean that the Professor expects some day that experimental physicists will *create life*. I ask the reader to compare this passage with the following from the *Vestiges of Creation*, fifth edition, London, 1846:—" * * * All animated nature may be said to be based on this mode of origin: *the fundamental form of organic being is a cell, having new cells forming within itself*, by which it is in time discharged, and which are again followed by others and others in endless succession. It is of course obvious that if these cells could be produced by any process from inorganic elements, we should be entitled to say that the fact of the transit from the inorganic into the organic had been witnessed in that instance, the possibility of the commencement of animated creation by the ordinary laws of nature might be considered as established. Now it was announced some years ago by Prevost and Dumas that *globules could be produced in albumen by electricity*. If, therefore, these globules be identical with the cells which are now held to be reproductive, it might be said that the production of albumen by artificial means is the only step in the process wanting. This has not yet been effected, but is known only to be a chemical process, the mode of which may be any day discovered in the laboratory."

It is a quarter of a century since the above was written, and the same chapter contains some account of the experiments of two electricians who were said to have brought the conditions of vital creation together, and produced a being which was called after one of them *Acarus Crossii*. But with the impetus that has been given to experimental science since that time, now, A.D. 1870, Dr. Huxley says that as a matter of observed fact *biogenesis* is victorious along the whole line, and yet he thinks it *presumption* if anyone should be inclined to doubt the possibility of bringing the conditions together, after continuous trial for a whole generation by those who are most anxious to find what they seek—a case of *abiogenesis*. The case is so complete that Dr. Huxley does not even refer to the investigations of Crosse and Weekes, and it is not to be wondered at that he should forget Hugh Miller. Is it "philosophic faith," Dr. Huxley, or is it a weak credulity that expects to find that for which there is not a tittle of evidence that it ever existed or can exist? In all the vast laboratory of nature, either in arctic ice or torrid plains or forests, deep seas or lofty Alps, we look in vain for one instance of aught but *biogenesis*. Is it faith, then, or bigotry that looks for *abiogenesis* still? As a fact it does not exist. It boots not to say that the *physique* of our planet is different, and that the *pre-geologic* ages might yield different conditions, for a distinguished adherent of the development theory (Sir C. Lyell) asks us to believe that the forces of nature are now as they have ever been, world without beginning, amen.

Confessedly *biogenesis* has not been found in nature or by art. The question then remains, does *xenogenesis* exist, or are all cases of the generation of living being cases of *homogenesis*? If the former, then the development theory *may* be true, i.e., if the cases known of *xenogenesis* show a sufficiently wide divergence of the offspring from the parent as to warrant the belief that it might extend to specific or generic differences. Hence evidently we

must carefully look at the investigations in this direction. Dr. Huxley tells us of the microscopic examinations that inform us that the dead fly on our window this month, surrounded by hazy matter, has been killed by a minute fungus that grows within it, and whose spores are scattered about, forming the dusty substance round. These spores germinate when they come into contact with the body of another fly, and so the disease is propagated. At first it was thought the fungus originated in the fly without a germ, but every stage of growth has been now traced, and the *homogenesis* established. So also a disease of silkworms has been likewise seen to give no support to the *xenogenesis* theory, and the range of investigation is getting gradually narrowed as the power of the microscope increases, and the skill of the investigators with it. There are some forms of human disease that remain to be examined on this subject. For instance, are *cancers* and nasal *polypi* organisms having their origin solely from abnormal conditions of the organism in which they are situate, or are they also the result of germs deposited from without? Considering what has been discovered and the investigations now going on as to the mortality arising from flesh wounds and the breath of patients in different forms of disease, the writer does not consider it presumption to say he has a *philosophic faith* that the beginning of all organisms will be found to be in germs, and that probably before another quarter of a century even Professor Huxley will say, if he live, that *HOMOGENESIS* is victorious along the whole line!

For the purpose of enabling the most unlearned reader to judge of this, I will state a few of the points that have been set at rest since the passage from the *Vestiges* was written. The vegetation called *mould*, the microscopic animals living in water, and infusions of other substances and so called *infusoria*, and the animals which, like the tapeworm, live within other animals, and are called *entozoa*, were, thirty years ago, problems unsolved as to the method of their genesis. Those who held the spontaneous theory in its most modified form considered these cases of *xenogenesis*. It was shown of some animalcules, that whenever they were observed to propagate their species they did it, not by producing eggs, but by *splitting their bodies*, and this is also true in degree of the tapeworm. Then it was said in these cases that nature appeared to provide for the existence of these creatures in the proper circumstances without the intervention of animals of like kind. But the careful observations of *Charles Bonnet*, more than a hundred years ago, on the generation of the *aphidæ*—plant-lice, those little green creatures that are found on trees and flowers, of which the largest are not more than an eighth of an inch in length—had already suggested the true explanation. It is found that a single one of these insects, without any intercourse with others, produces other insects from its own body, and that those so produced again produce in like manner, as many as five generations in four days. But this is only during the summer; when the autumn comes the two sexes are seen, and eggs are produced from which the succeeding year's *aphides* are to be generated. There are now no cases of animals known producing by fission (splitting) which do not recur or may be believed to recur to the ordinary method of generation at fixed intervals. We say this on the authority of Huxley himself, for so far, he says, *biogenesis* is "victorious along the whole line."

Again, the curious organisms in domestic pigs—not found in wild ones—which constitute the disease called *measles* in pork, are now known to be a certain stage of the existence of the creature called tapeworm. If the meat be well cooked they may be destroyed; but if otherwise, and they

pass into the alimentary canal of a man or horse, they develop into the head of a *tænia*, or tapeworm, which then by successive *fission* propagates itself, each part being very slightly attached to the next, and each part producing eggs which pass out of the infested animal, and being unconsciously eaten by the pigs again (or calves), certain little hooks on them enable them to bore their way out of the stomach to the fleshy parts of the animal, and, attaining the development there seen (as measles), they wait to be eaten again to become egg-producing tapeworm. The author of the *Vestiges* did not know this; Dr. Huxley does. Again, about mould appearing in such strange places and such curious circumstances. The explanation is, that the air is a vast "stirabout" of germs (eggs) invisible to the eye, and that these germinate and produce vegetables or animals, according to their kind, wherever in the course of the winds they find suitable conditions. The air can be strained, and mould prevented where under other circumstances it would be sure to occur. It is now believed that many diseases in man and other animals owe their existence to these germs, which are taken in the breath or enter wounds in the flesh. So, proper means being taken for the removal or destruction of the germs, we may expect much human misery to be alleviated by the investigations now being made by Dr. Grace Calvert and others.

The cases given above were all relied upon by the author of the *Vestiges* as affording ground for believing in *abiogenesis*, or at least in that modification of it now called *xenogenesis*. They are all given up by Huxley. There is no case yet made out for anything but *homogenesis*. But supposing *xenogenesis* to be established by any of these cases amongst the lowest forms of animal life, what then? It would not follow that development could take place in any higher animals, for there is a marked distinction between them in this matter of *fission*. John Marshall, the eminent physiologist, says "This development by alternate generation never occurs in the *vertebrata*, and only rarely in the higher *non-vertebrata*. Amongst the *mollusca* no proper example of alternate generation has yet been met with." So that as far as facts go we are without any warrant for belief that "flakes of lymph from one organism" could generate another kind of creature. Again, Dr. Huxley never mentions in his speech the researches of Charles Darwin among *pigeons*, so we may assume that they, too, are among the things that were, and thus it remains that in all historic time, in all geologic periods, from the *eozyon canadense* to the noble Caucasian, Dr. Huxley, there is no case of transmutation of species, and as to their origin, the simplest and easiest and most reverent explanation is, that God created them.

Speaking of that pre-geologic period in which Huxley would expect to see "the evolution of living protoplasm from not living matter" an American geologist says that science, without "suggesting query or doubt, naturally and inevitably and cheerfully pronounces the name of God." And in looking back to the beginning of life of any single species, whether now existing or entombed in cainozoic, mezozoic, or palæozoic strata, science ought surely to do the same. God is the only hypothesis that covers all the circumstances of the case, and for any other theory there is confessedly, so far, no evidence whatever, and we live in the age of the inductive method of investigation. Of the mighty argument of His being that exists in His works we shall say nothing here, but we chronicle the fact that hitherto, to this fourteenth day of September, one thousand eight hundred and seventy, Dr. Huxley being recorder, there is nothing in nature, and no revelation of the chemist, physiologist, or naturalist, that

indicates any spontaneous beginning of life, or any specific change in the character of the life once begun. I would venture to add that this date is truly described as *Annus Domini*.
R. HAY.

PUBLIC DEBATE ON CHRISTIANITY.

THE discussion between D. King and C. Bradlaugh, arranged to take place in Bury, September 27th and three following nights, and to be resumed October 25th, and continue the four succeeding evenings (in all nine nights), commenced on the first of the foregoing dates. Two evenings were devoted to the question "*What is Christianity?*" and the remaining two were occupied upon the second topic—"*Is Christianity of Divine Origin?*" Each speaker had four speeches each evening—one of half an hour and three of a quarter. The chairmen for Mr. King were the Rev. W. R. Thornburn, M.A., Rev. G. Scott, D.D., Rev. F. Webb, Rev. W. Roseman. Mr. Bradlaugh's chairmen were Mr. Slater, Mr. Blacker, Mr. Peel. The Umpire for the four evenings was J. Duckworth, Esq. The Co-operative Hall, which seats over a thousand persons, was the place of meeting, and well filled each evening.

The course taken by Mr. King was that of entering at once upon the subject of the evening and persistently keeping to it, avoiding personalities and going on in the even tenor of his way. That of Mr. Bradlaugh was marked by determination to raise side issues, apply contemptuous epithets to the arguments of his opponent, in place of attempting to answer them, and to turn the whole debate into a conflict over personalities. His set purpose, from the first, was that of making the impression that his opponent ranked with the awfully heterodox, and his determination was to punish him for compelling him to debate without getting deeply into the pockets of believers. He was violent and grossly insulting, declaring he would drive his opponent from the platform; but his vehement abuse fell, so far as Mr. King was concerned, like water upon a duck's back. He was evidently enraged at being unable to produce retaliation. He did argue, but not by way of answering the evidence of the Divine Origin of Christianity largely presented by his opponent. His course was that of crowding in alleged Bible discrepancies and monstrosities in the fewest possible words, and in such number, that the fastest speaker could not take up more than the half of them in the entire time allotted for his share of the debate. This, of course, was intended to draw off his opponent from his line of argument and then, whichever of his points received notice, taunt him with not having attended to the others. The trick, however, was thoroughly exposed, and the audience appeared to see through it. We shall not attempt an outline of the argument, as the whole was reported by a competent reporter, at the cost of Mr. King (Mr. Bradlaugh not wishing to publish it), and will be published so soon as it can be got through the press. The questions, which, at the time of writing this, stand over for discussion are—"What are the legitimate effects of Christianity?"—"What is Secularism, and what can it do for man that Christianity cannot?"—"Is the Bible account of Creation in accordance with reason and science?"—Ed.

THE DEBATE ON CHRISTIANITY.

HAVING returned from the discussion between D. King and C. Bradlaugh held in Bury, commencing September 27th, and continuing four nights, I purpose a brief note for insertion.

The proposition for the first two evenings was, "What is Christianity?" Mr. King first proceeded to settle the standard of appeal, which he very properly declared to be the New Testament, and nothing else. Having shown that by Christianity we must understand the doctrine recorded in the New Testament as taught by Christ and His Apostles, he gave a clear, succinct, and comprehensive view of the broad features of the Christian faith.

It was expected by many, myself included, that Mr. Bradlaugh, in following, would either admit the things advanced or proceed to state points he could not accept, and then have taken issue. This, however, he did not do. Mr. Bradlaugh defined Christianity as teaching justification by faith alone. A man, according to Mr. B.'s view of Christianity, might be a deceiver, a liar, a murderer, and yet if he only believed he was sure of Heaven at death. The punishment of the wicked and the atonement were also introduced by Mr. Bradlaugh, and treated in a manner which either indicated wilful and deliberate misrepresentation or betrayed the grossest ignorance of these subjects in their Biblical relations. Upon these points Mr. King took issue with his opponent, and disposed of them in a manner which must have been satisfactory to every person whose thinking powers have not been hopelessly perverted. Of this the audience gave unmistakable signs, his luminous expositions of those subjects being greeted with hearty and prolonged applause.

On the third evening Mr. King opened by introducing the second proposition, "Is Christianity of Divine Origin?" In support of this proposition, the discussion of which occupied the third and fourth nights, Mr. King advanced a series of arguments, and these arguments taken together gave overwhelming evidence that God has spoken to man, and that Christianity is of Divine origin.

I have read many debates, but never have I met with anything more lame and contemptible than Mr. Bradlaugh's attempt to grapple with the massive arguments advanced in proof of the Divine origin of Christianity. He literally staggered beneath the heavy blows dealt out to him upon his Mahometan and Mormon argument. Never did Infidelity appear to me so utterly weak as it does at this moment, as I think upon the discomfiture of its haughty champion, Charles Bradlaugh, Esq., President of the Secular Union. Never did Christianity appear to me so strong as it does at this moment, in view of that magnificent demonstration of its Divine origin, which the great Iconoclast has scarcely dared to touch.

The arrangement which prevents Mr. Bradlaugh from pocketing the proceeds of the debate seems to have stung him to the quick. Hence we had it obtruded upon the meeting every evening. But it is difficult to discover what connection arrangements as to money can possibly have with the Divine origin of Christianity. Truly "the legs of the lame are not equal."

Mr. Bradlaugh possesses in many respects ability of a very superior order, but everything about him seems to be run wild. How his countenance, wrought up at times till it became quite fierce with passion, contrasted with the calm and dignified bearing of his opponent. And how strikingly his fiery and sometimes withering declamation contrasted with the cool, clear, and logical demonstrations of Mr. King.

There are yet five nights of this discussion to come off, after which the whole will appear in a volume; and, taking what has been done as a sample of what is yet to be, the book will no doubt take a high place among works of its kind.

JOHN STRANG.

METHODISM IN TROUBLE.

METHODISTS in America have long been troubled by having their own standard books quoted against them. The declaration, too, has frequently been made that Methodism is not what it was a half century ago; that the M. E. Church has apostatized from the teachings of its great leaders and founders. The Minutes of the General Conference of the M. E. Church South show that so far as that body is concerned the assertion is true.

The St. Joseph *Gazette* clips the following from the Minutes of the General Conference of the E. Church South :

“ ‘The following resolution was offered in the Conference :—

“ ‘*Resolved* by this General Conference that, notwithstanding Wesley’s Sermons, Clarke’s Commentaries and Watson’s Institutes are amongst the books in the course of study prescribed for those who are to be ordained deacons and elders, or are admitted into the traveling ministry of the M. E. Church South; yet this fact is not to be construed into an endorsement *by this body, our church*, of what these authors have said in regard to the design of baptism.

“ ‘B. H. Spencer thought that there was much injury done by quotations from the works referred to in his resolution.

“ ‘Dr. Rush said that, knowing as he did that they had to meet objections brought out by quotations from these works, he thought it should have some sort of reference. He did not think that Wesley believed the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, but there are those who seize on these forms of expression in his writings, to our disadvantage, and that relief should be given, if possible.

“ ‘Dr. Hamilton said that he did not think that the brethren should feel such sensitiveness on this subject; that the English Methodists always discriminated between various parts of Wesley’s works; that Clarke’s Commentary was never adopted as a standard; there were things in that work which he did not believe and never could. He knew that brethren did find difficulty on this point, but he did not see what relief could be afforded.

“ ‘The resolution was referred to the College of Bishops.’

“ ‘What was done with the resolution we have not yet learned, but we have enough before us to show that there is trouble in the camp, and that something must be done if possible.’”

What have these men taught touching the design of baptism? Wesley taught that the very moment a person has justifying faith he is justified; but in his sermon on the Church he says that baptism is a precious means whereby this faith and hope are given. This corresponds with his note on Acts xxii. 16. “Baptism to a real penitent is both the means and seal of pardon, nor did God ordinarily in the primitive church bestow this upon any except through this means.”

Clarke, in his comments on 1 Pet. iii. 21, says: “Now as the waters of the flood could not have saved Noah and his family, had they not made use of the ark, so the water of baptism saves no man, but as it is the means of his getting his heart purified by the holy Spirit.”

On the same passage Watson in his Institutes says: “In like manner baptism has an end—an intent; not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but obtaining a good conscience toward God. It is thus that we see how Peter preserves the correspondence between the act of Noah in preparing the ark as an act of faith by which he was justified, and the act of submitting to Christian baptism, which is also obviously an act of faith in order to the remission of sins, or the obtaining of a good conscience before God.

Now as the M. E. Church South refuses to endorse these authors on the design of baptism, they condemn the New Testament also, for it teaches that baptism is "for the remission of sins," that "baptism saves us," that "he that believes and is baptized shall be saved."

Knowing as we do both by personal observation and the confessions of Drs. Rush, Hamilton and others, in the General Conference of the M. E. Church South, that the cause of mourner's-bench religion has suffered by quotations from Wesley, Clarke and Watson, let us not become weary in directing the minds of the people to the pure teaching of the word of God, for as in the past so in the future our efforts will be crowned with success.

M. N. PARKER.

WHY NONCONFORMISTS OBJECTED TO THE PROPOSED CENSUS.

THE proposal to take a census of religious belief has, as our readers are aware, been defeated. The defeat is partly owing to the consistent and sustained votes of Liberal members, but primarily to the pronounced opinions and prompt action of various Nonconformist bodies. We think it desirable to quote the resolutions upon this subject adopted by the Liberation Society, the Dissenting Deputies, and the Wesleyan Conference. The Executive Committee of the Liberation Society objected to the proposal for the following reasons:—

"1. Because a large number of persons conscientiously believe that the Government has no right to compel individuals to make any declaration in regard to their religious belief or practice. Many of these will feel bound to withhold the required information, and, to that extent, the returns obtained will be seriously defective.

"2. Because the undefined position of numerous individuals, in regard to religion, or to religious organisations, would render it difficult for them to make an accurate return; while the returns furnished by occupiers, on behalf of others, would, in many cases, be untrustworthy and misleading.

"3. Because, while a very considerable portion of the population are not in the habit of attending places of worship, and are unconnected with any religious body, their unwillingness to admit the fact would lead them to give replies which would be untrue, and altogether fallacious.

"4. Because, from the political importance known to be attached at the present time to ecclesiastical statistics, the members of the various denominations would be strongly tempted to resort to improper means to swell their respective numbers.

"5. Because the attempt to take such a census would not merely furnish an occasion for misrepresentation and fraud, but would give rise to suspicion and to irritation of feeling—both now and hereafter—which would outweigh the advantages likely to arise from the inquiry, even were it possible to ensure accurate and reliable results."

Liberator.

Family Room.

REPINING AND REPENTING.

"The foolishness of man perverteth his way, and his heart fretteth against the Lord."
—Pro. xix. 3.

"If any say I have sinned and perverted that which is right, and it profiteth me not, He is gracious unto him."—Job. xxxiii. 27.

MURMURING and mourning are here set forth. How much does God say, in his word, against the one—how much in commendation of the other? Yet man is prone to the

former and backward to the latter. It is natural to fallen man to murmur against God's action. It is a spiritual act rightly to mourn over our own misdoings. If we read the histories

of God's book we find none were more severely punished than the murmurers. God still whispers, "Neither murmur ye;" and many threatenings hang over the heads of those who do so. He who was so emphatically "a man of sorrows," whose heart never held a murmuring thought, and from whose tongue the hasty word never dropped, says, "Blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted." God looks down complacently and compassionately on mourning souls, and says of each, as of Ephraim, "I have surely heard him bemoaning himself." "I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the Lord." Those who murmur most

against God have themselves to blame, they have "perverted their own way." Those who see this and mourn over the same, do so because they look at their own way in the light of God's law, and in the light of his love. They look on Him whom they have pierced and mourn. Blessed mourning which attracts God's notice and is followed by his consolations! Let us watch against the tendency to murmur, and cherish those thoughts which produce contrition without despondency. The first is like the blighting east wind, the second like the warm southern breeze, which is followed by the fruit-producing shower. J. C.

FLAW HUNTERS.

THERE are people who have a preternatural faculty for detecting evil, or the appearance of evil, in any man's character. They have a fatal scent for carrion. Their memory is like a museum I once saw at a medical college, and illustrates all the hideous distortions, and monstrous growths and revolting diseases by which humanity can be troubled or afflicted. They think they have a wonderful knowledge of human nature. But it is a blunder to mistake the Newgate Calendar for a biographical dictionary!

A less offensive type of the same tendency leads some people to find apparent satisfaction in the discovery and proclamation of the slightest defects in the habits of good men and conduct of public institutions. They cannot talk about the benefits conferred by a great hospital without lamenting some insignificant blot in its laws, and some trifling want of prudence in its management. Speak to them about a man whose good works everybody is admiring, and they cool your ardour by regretting that he is so rough in his manner,

or so smooth—that his temper is so hasty, or that he is so fond of applause. They seem to hold a brief, requiring of them to prove the impossibility of human perfection. They detect the slightest alloy in the pure gold of human goodness. That there are spots in the sun is, with them, something more than an observed fact—it takes rank with *a priori* and necessary truths.

There are people who, if they hear an organ, find out at once which are the poorest stops. If they listen to a great speaker, they remember nothing but some slip in the construction of a sentence, the consistency of a metaphor, or the evolutions of an argument. While their friends are admiring the wealth and beauty of a tree whose branches are weighed down with fruit, they have discovered a solitary bough, lost in golden affluence, on which nothing is hanging.

Poor Hazlitt was sorely troubled with them in his time. "Littleness," he said, "is their element, and they give a character of meanness to whatever they touch."—*Good Words*.

DR. FRANKLIN'S MODE OF LENDING MONEY.

I SEND you, herewith, a bill of ten *Louis d'ors*. I do not pretend to give much; I only *lend* it to you. When you return to your country, you cannot fail of getting into some business that will in time enable you to pay all your debts. In that case, when you meet another honest man in similar distress, you will pay me, by lending this money to him, enforcing him to discharge the debt by a like operation when he shall be able, and shall meet with such another opportunity. I hope it may thus pass through many hands before it meets a knave to stop its progress. This is a trick of mine to do a great deal of good with little money. I am not rich enough to afford much in good works, and so am obliged to be cunning, and make the most out of little."

THE HAPPY HOME.

'Tis Paradise regained, when home is blessed
With words from God and heaven-ascending prayer;
When God's good hand is seen, his power confessed:—
Thrice favoured spot! the light of heaven is there.

'Tis heaven on earth, when home is ordered well
With timely precepts from the book divine;
When parents' lips the gospel story tell,
And christian graces in their conduct shine.

'Tis like the home above where angels live,
And each pure spirit waits Jehovah's will:—
When sons to fathers cheerful service give,
And, mothers' words, their daughters swift fulfil.

Yet if, within the sacred bounds of home,
The foot of sin intruding-entrance gain;
Here let repentance and confession come,
And sweet forgiveness heal the mourner's pain.

So shall our homes at once be types of heaven,
And, of the church on earth, give likeness too;
So shall the power of Christ purge out the leaven
Of sin and malice, and make all anew.

So shall our tent be daily moved along,
Approaching nearer to our heavenly rest;
So shall the sacred word, the prayer, the song,
Prepare us for the mansions of the blessed.

J. B. ROTHERHAM.

Intelligence of Churches, &c.

THE BIBLE ON THE CONTINENT.

AGENTS of the Bible Societies are sending home favourable reports of the success which is attending their efforts to put tracts and copies of the Bible into the hands of the soldiers of the belligerent armies. Mr. Davies, of the British and Foreign Bible

Society, has distributed within five weeks at Berlin, Cologne, and Frankfort, no fewer than 126,441 Bibles, Testaments, and tracts, and he states that all were glad to receive God's Holy Word. One of the French colporteurs of the Scottish National Bible

Society, states that at Compiègne and Soissons, he disposed of a number of New Testaments, and that although a number of the young men were either indifferent or sceptical, he believes that the work in which he is engaged will be abundantly blessed under the heavy affliction which has befallen France. Reports also come from Spain to the same effect, and it is stated that there is a religious awakening in that country through the Protestant agencies at work. One who was in that country a week or two ago, says that he observed a great change in Madrid with respect to attendance on the preaching of the Gospel, since he visited it last summer. He states that evangelistic meetings are held in different parts of Spain, attended by

from 200 to 300 persons, and from all the accounts which come to hand it would appear that a spirit of enquiry is abroad which, if properly directed, may be attended with the best results. It is, however, evident that there are many things to counteract the efforts being made, and that the political element is at times mixed up with the religious. Some of the colporteurs have to make up their mind to encounter hardship, and we find Mr. Davies stating that in two months' time he had spent twenty-three nights in railway carriages, or sleeping covered by his railway wrapper on loose straw. When work of this kind is undertaken in such a resolute spirit it augurs favourably for it. *Christian World.*

AUSTRALIA.

ADELAIDE.—During the past month *one* has been added by commendation. Our audiences continue large, and we hope ere long to reap more abundant fruits.—T. J. G.

MILANG.—During the past month *three* have become "obedient to the faith," and been received into the Church at Langhorne's Creek. It will be interesting to our readers to know that one of these is a black native, educated at Port Lincoln, a very fair scholar, and for some time a devout reader of God's Word. S. Judd.

STRATHALBYN, July 20th.—On Tuesday the 12th instant, a Reception Tea was given here in recognition of the arrival of Thos. Porter, as Evangelist to this Church. At four p.m. punctually the spread was complete, and about 250 persons partook thereof. At half-past six o'clock a public meeting was presided over by P. Santo, who with Messrs. T. J. Gore, M.A., S. Kidner, T. Porter, and W. Judd, addressed from 400 to 500 persons, amongst whom were friends from Willunga, Milang, Point Sturt, Langhorne's Creek, Stirling East, &c., &c. The report of the Church was read which showed that it had existed for eight months, during which time *thirty-five* members had been added thereto, on a profession of their faith in Christ by baptism, and that there were now *forty-nine* members. Mr. Wade, (Superintendent of the Sunday School) gave a most encouraging report of that institution, which consists of eighty-five children, from amongst whom seven had recently been baptized. Since my letter of the 20th ult., *eight* persons have been added to the Church by faith and baptism, six of whom are Sunday Scholars.

S. R. BOBISTO.

MELBOURNE, July 19th, 1870.—Since last report *thirty-one* have made "the good

confession," and two have been received by commendation. Br. Surber goes on the 28th of July to Maryboro' to preach for a season. O. A. CAER.

BALLAARAT, DAWSON STREET.—We take pleasure in reporting that the labours of our Br. Hamill in this town, have been instrumental in exciting a spirit of inquiry respecting the New Testament order. Our brother has been doing "the work of an evangelist" by visiting from house to house, and has there disturbed the quiet that was existing in the minds of several who, up to that time, had paid more attention to the words of man, than to those of God, and the issue has been that they have left their party leaders and determined to follow Christ. These again have acted as missionaries, and introduced our brother to others who have followed a good example, until, including some from our Lord's-day School, *forty* have, since our last report, come forward and obeyed their Lord in baptism. Our brother's teachings are plain and practical; he shows the people that the Lord requires his followers to be baptized—that baptism is immersion, that it is for the remission of sins, and that then rejoicing in the liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free, their motto should ever afterwards be—onward, upward! M.

NEW SOUTH WALES.

SIDNEY, July 13th, 1870.—With gratitude and joy I have to report the discipleship of *four* more since last letter. S. H. COLLS.

NEWTOWN, near SYDNEY, July 13th, 1870.—The Church in this town is the oldest in the colony, having existed for about *eighteen* years. Some of its pioneer members are now in Victoria. The leading brethren have had plenty of hard work, and sharp conflict; the out-come of all which is a somewhat

mellow experience. The Church numbering about eighty members, is under the oversight of our venerable brother Kingsbury, assisted by Brethren Day, and Hawkins. The two last-named brethren take part in the important work of teaching the young. About sixty scholars belong to the School, several of whom are disciples to the Lord Jesus. A substantial brick-built church edifice was erected in 1867. Two believers have recently gone "down into, and come up out of the water." One of them is the husband of a Baptist Sister from Queensland, who has cast in her lot with us; the other is the youngest son of Elder Kingsbury.

who, with his esteemed partner, now rejoices over an entire family in the fold of Christ.
S. H. COLES.

NEW ZEALAND.

DUNEDIN, June 29th, 1870.—Since last report one has made "the good confession" been baptized and added to the saved. May God still be with us and smile upon our efforts to increase the number of the saved, and continue unto us that peace and harmony which prevail in our midst, is our sincere prayer.—Yours in Christ,

SAMUEL ELBORN.

AMERICA.

COLUMBIA, Mo., Aug. 8, 1870.—Yesterday I spoke to a good audience in Columbia; there were three additions; one confessed the Saviour and was straitway immersed, and two took membership who had not long since obeyed the gospel. On Saturday I was at Skull-lick, in Audrain county, where Br. Mountjoy, assisted by Br. Crisman, had been conducting a meeting for eight or ten days; when I left there had been thirty-seven additions.

T. M. A.

RUSHVILLE, IND., Aug. 17, 1870.—My meeting at Louisville closed after four weeks with sixty additions. Our last meeting was held in the central church and was a grand reunion of all the Churches. Long shall I remember the Louisville Christians for their hearty co-operation and liberal support. Would to God we had many more such preachers as those with whom I formed an acquaintance there. The three churches cannot but prosper under the pastoral charge of brethren Hopson, Dawson and Keith. God bless them all and all others. The good sisters of Louisville presented Mrs. Shaw with a beautiful set of silver, worth

about seventy-five dollars, for which she could scarcely find words to express her gratitude, little dreaming of being so remembered by comparative strangers. I preached two weeks in July in New Albany, with twenty-six additions, and the bringing about of a much happier state of feeling than we found. Br. Parker is now their pastor, and I anticipate for them a glorious future. There have been, under the labours of your humble servant, since last report, at different points, about 325 additions. Praise the Lord—let all adore him. Praise his name for evermore.

KNOWLES SHAW.

MEXICO.—"Six Churches have been organized in Mexico on the basis of the Bible as the word of God—a spontaneous movement, without any foreign intervention, the sacraments administered without any ordained minister."

This is clipped from a secular paper. The word "minister" having its popular meaning. We say unhesitatingly these are the right kind of organizations. Well done for Mexico.

ENGLAND

BRIGHTON.—We are now in our new meeting place, a Chapel holding about 250 persons. It is well known and in a good situation. We can trace the hand of Providence in leading us to this place, and we gladly raise our Ebenezer, saying "Hitherto hath the Lord helped us." Since our removal we have had five additions, the youngest of whom was fifteen years of age, and the oldest seventy-five. We have good attentive audiences. Others are enquiring, and seem not far from the kingdom. We have commenced our winter course of Lectures, and trust that our Father's blessing may attend our efforts. The

address of our meeting place is Ship Street Chapel, Union Street, near the General Post Office.

B. ELLIS.

LEICESTER.—Ed. Evans returned home on Oct. 3rd, after spending six Lord's Days with us. During that time ten persons were immersed and two restored. It was a pleasing sight to witness the immersion of seven females one evening, five of whom were a mother and four daughters. Since Bro. E. left two others have been restored to the fellowship of the Church. These, with one immersed prior to his visit, make in all fifteen additions since the Annual Meeting.

J. L.

LATTER-DAY SAINT CONFERENCE.—The Annual Conference of the Birmingham District of Latter-day Saints was held in the Temperance Hall, Birmingham on one of the Sundays of last month. At the service in the morning, over which Mr. Lot Smith (President of the Birmingham Conference) presided, Mr. Freece read a report with regard to Birmingham and the district, showing that the number of branches was 12, elders 87, priests 39, teachers 23, deacons 24; total number of officers, 173; persons baptised, 38; number received from other Conferences, 11; removed, 8; emigrants, 111; persons excommunicated, 28; deceased, 11; total number of members, 725; officers and members (including 27 scattered), 898. The report, embodying, besides the above statistics, a financial statement of a satisfactory nature, was adopted. The resolution was passed, "sustaining" Brigham Young president of and trustee for the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints;" George A. Smith his first, and Daniel H. Wells his second councillor; Orson Smith, President of the quorum of Twelve Apostles; John Smith, patriarch of the Church; Elias Smith, president of the high priest quorum; George A. Smith, historian of the Church; and "all the authorities as they are now constituted in Zion." The meeting was afterwards addressed by Mr. George W. Groo (president of the Leicester Conference), who during the course of his remarks congratulated those present upon the progress which was being made with regard to their religion, and the augmentation of their numbers.

BRITISH TEMPERANCE LEAGUE.—The Annual Conference of the British Temperance League resolved to present a copy of the "Temperance Bible Commentary" to each of the scholars engaged in the revision of the English version of the sacred Scriptures. For this purpose fifty-four copies were required. The authors of the Commentary, Dr. F. R. Lees and Rev. Dawson Burns, M.A., accompanied this presentation by a letter to each of the scholars, from a number of whom very courteous acknowledgments and thanks have already been received. Dr. Lees and Mr. Burns draw particular attention to the criticisms upon *tirosah*, *shakar*, and *nephahios*, and the rendering of these words by "vine fruit," "sweet drink," and "abstinent," so as to give the strict English equivalents, without importing into the terms any dogmatic or foregone conclusion. Here, as elsewhere, that canon of philology which forbids the generic terms of one language to be converted into the *specific* terms of another, or the reverse, and so obscuring their exact significance as determined by the context, will, they doubt not, receive practical and inflexible sanction.

THE MODE OF BAPTISM.—A writer in the Boston Post (United States) says that Mr.

Chrystal,—an Episcopal clergyman, who has been baptized in the Greek Church, and believes in immersion as the true mode of baptism,—applied for the use of S. A. Corey's Chapel, on Murray Hill. The writer goes on to say: "Last Sunday, while Mr. Chrystal was waiting for an interview with Mr. Corey, Dr. Tyng stepped in to see the chapel, as it really contests the palm with St. George's for gorgeous decoration. Mr. Corey mentioned that Mr. Chrystal was waiting for him in his study, and stated his purpose. Dr. Tyng said: 'You baptists don't know how to baptize. You lead people down into the pool and immerse them face upward, filling their eyes, ears, and mouth with water, and half strangling the candidate. Instead of that,' said the Doctor, 'you should do as they do in the East, where you profess to get your authority. This is the way to baptize,' said the Doctor, getting down on his knees in the centre aisle. 'Let the candidate kneel, and you have but little way to place him under water. One hand should be placed on the forehead, and the other placed on the back of the head, and then the candidate gently pressed forward until the immersion is complete.' It is well known that when Dr. Judson engaged himself to Fanny Forester she was a Presbyterian. She was baptized by Dr. Judson in the church at Utica. He baptized her in the style described by Dr. Tyng, and it gave great scandal to the old line of Baptists. Dr. Judson defended the practice as Eastern and Apostolic, and said it was the mode in which all the converts in Burmah were introduced into the Church. It was an interesting sight to see old Dr. Tyng down on his knees in a Baptist Church, instructing a Baptist minister how to perform the peculiar ordinance of his denomination."

Obituary.

DIED at Tokomairiro, Otago, New Zealand, on the 15th June, 1870, of cancer of the stomach, David Dewar, aged 66. He was one of eleven members of the Church in Cupar Fife, who left there in 1857, for Otago. They were the pioneers of the Church now meeting in the Odd Fellow's Hall, Dunedin. He was the oldest of the party, of whom two are now dead, six are still in Otago, and two in Invercargill. He took part in all the early and many difficulties they had, especially in winter; only three or four thus coming together, to "break bread," sing a hymn or two, read a chapter, and engage in prayer, then separate. He lived to see the two or three ears of corn become a large handful; and where there had been only a few humble worshippers, with no ability, little courage, and everything to dishearten, he left a flourishing Church. His end was peace.

J. B.

CHANGES—TO OUR READERS.

WE tread on yellow leaves, and, as at this season, they drop to the ground so do our fellow workers fall from the living tree of humanity. With this issue of our pages our Editorial work for 1870 comes to an end. Some of our writers and readers have passed away. The work of the year is done, and its influence for good or for evil must remain for ever. In looking over the volume, thus completed, we rejoice in finding but little that we would not gladly reprint; much that is of the highest importance, and little or nothing we deem detrimental. May the same conclusion be truthfully arrived at with reference to all future efforts!

As men depart so do years—one after another they pass into eternity, and leave their burden of work to be contemplated by posterity. This year (1870) has a budget neither small nor unimportant. It is not now our purpose to review that work, we merely allude to its vastness; in this respect it is perhaps beyond comparison with any year of the present century, and as those view it who see God in history, and whose faith discerns the Divine hand behind the movements of armies, the convulsions of nations, and the extension of empires, its every change is big with import to the Church and Kingdom of Christ. These changes, and those that must grow out of them, demand a vigilant eye, and call especially upon the Church to be observant, that every proper advantage may be taken as the providence of God is unfolded. These remarks, coupled with our Editorial of last month, may serve to prepare for a statement regarding our purpose in the coming year, if, through the mercy and goodness of God, we are permitted to continue our monthly issues. The *British Harbinger*, then, will appear on the 1st of January, and continue monthly, at the same price, but under a new title. Henceforth it will be known as

"THE ECCLESIASTICAL OBSERVER."

It is well known that the present title is not of our selecting, and has only been retained because we could not see the way open to get rid of it. In its former shape (*The Millennial Harbinger*) it was misleading, and in its present it is indefinite. Several titles have been suggested, but hardly a second person among those we could consult was found to approve any one of them, with the exception of the one adopted. Applying the term *Ecclesiastical* comprehensively, the selected title completely and exactly expresses the work to which our pages are devoted. True it does not indicate the set purpose to lead back to the Primitive Faith and Order of the Church of God. But that can scarcely be expressed in any title unless it be one that is decidedly calculated rather to shut us out from those beyond our own immediate connection than to gain us a hearing. Our business, then, according to our title, is to *Observe* things *Ecclesiastical*—that is, things (all things) appertaining to the Church and the Churches. Consequently we include the things of Divine appointment appertaining to the Apostolic time; the things of early and later apostacies; and whatever in the nations affects existing ecclesiastical establishments, directly or indirectly, so as to be a matter of concern and interest to the Church of Christ. And surely we may say, If the men who live to restore the pure faith and order of the Church—who contend for a return to the good old ways of the Apostles of Christ—are not *Ecclesiastical Observers*, who under the broad heavens can be so designated?

But does this change of title mean nothing more than the substitution of one name for the other? Are we to understand that the contents will remain exactly as heretofore? Is it a new designation for an old arrange-

ment, or shall we look for difference otherwise than in the title? The answer is, that a decided change in the style of contents is intended, to which we are in part compelled by the Post Office Authorities. To meet a considerable circulation in our Colonies, and also our American readers, we are compelled to register as a newspaper, for transmission abroad. Under the new postal regulations the *Harbinger*, which has been thus registered for a number of years, is refused re-registration, and therefore could not be sent abroad otherwise than by book-post, which would cost twopence each copy, and compel an increase in charge to Colonial subscribers. On their account, then, we were anxious to appear with such contents as command registration as a newspaper. Our issue last month meets this requirement, and the *Ecclesiastical Observer* is registered for transmission abroad, and our subsequent issues will fairly and fully come up to the requirement of the new postal act. Some may be ready to ask whether it was desirable to sacrifice Home usefulness in favour of Colonial convenience. The answer is, certainly not! Nor would we do so. Our conviction is that the alteration was really needed, is a decided improvement, and was called for by the facts of the case. But are we to have a political and semi-secular paper to the exclusion of Biblical criticism and those admonitions so fitted and needful to elevate the life and enlarge the holiness of the Church? Unquestionably not! First, the act does not require that a newspaper shall be filled with news. It defines a newspaper as a publication devoted altogether, or in the greater part, to news, passing events, or to comments thereupon. We have therefore the lesser part open for writing outside of that description, in addition to unlimited liberty of comment in the larger part for practical, soul-elevating, and expository discourse. The change necessitated we consider a decided improvement, and one we desired to make irrespective of any Government necessity. The chief reason for not making it earlier has been the increased labour resulting therefrom. It is an easy matter to re-print articles from our American publications, and this we have largely done. Henceforth we shall do far less in that direction. Not that we shall be at all compelled to exclude the truly excellent products of our American brethren, but that we shall use them in somewhat different combinations, and not to the former extent. What we henceforth present will generally have a connection with some passing event and come out with a living interest not hitherto realized.

Having thus explained our expectations we appeal to the reader for help. We believe this change is the one most likely to adapt our paper for circulation beyond the circle to which it has been almost entirely confined. But to reap that result we must sow accordingly—labour or money, or both, must be freely expended. Some have suggested an appeal to the Brotherhood to create an advertizing fund, urging that we would not be unsuccessful in so doing. But that which we now ask is, that the matter be brought at once under the notice and deliberation of each church, with a view to stimulate the membership to order in every possible case, and more particularly to put forth, at once, efforts to induce non-members to take our monthly issues. The contents will now be adapted to that end, and if each present subscriber would seek to obtain from neighbours and friends permission to supply them, and undertake to procure and deliver the copies ordered, there would at once be realized a far wider circulation than we have yet approached.

In another way we ask help. A newspaper can now be posted from any part of the kingdom at the cost of a halfpenny. Send us papers and

periodicals containing useful information desirable for reprinting, or calling for comment, marking the same to indicate the part intended. Let those also who can write for the press send their comments as well as their papers.

We want a *considerable* increase in circulation, not as a matter of personal advantage, but as an aid to spread the truth. We desire to secure the services of the most powerful writers that money can command. But with a circulation which only pays the outlay for printing and office work, and gives no compensation for present literary labour, we cannot advance to the payment of contributors. We believe that if the brethren take the work of increasing our circulation fairly in hand, a few months only would be requisite to enable us to do so. We urge them to respond, but cannot ask it as a favour, because personally we seek no advantage. Our periodical was not originated as a trade enterprise, but as a labour of love. It has never become a *property*, but has remained a *charge*, remunerating its conductors by giving them the privilege of bestowing labour, toil, and anxiety, as a work unto the Lord. If it be of real service in the cause of Christ, then to those who are interested in this cause we may surely say, Do not merely take it for your own convenience, pleasure, or profit, but *use* it; circulate it, labour in sending it around, as we have to do in preparing it for you.

It should be understood that while the last issue and the present indicate the direction to which our intended changes tend, these issues must not be taken as realizing what we hope to present when, on the first day of the coming year, we visit you under a new name.

BIBLE TRANSLATIONS AMONG FRENCH PROTESTANTS.

We are living in an age of free thought and action. The mere voice of *authority* has no longer the power over men that it once had. Men have long since been free to inquire and free to act. With all the inevitable license and licentiousness this freedom bears with it, still it is a blessed and glorious freedom that cannot be too highly cherished and rejoiced in; it is a gift of God.

Men are, by virtue of this free thought, discovering their wants and their rights; they are seeking to discover what is true and what is not true. They are demanding to enjoy the truth and to be freed from the bondage of error. They insist that their great legitimate rights shall be granted, and that the important wants of humanity shall be supplied. These imperious demands cannot now long be successfully resisted. Those in possession of old privileges against humanity—the temporal and spiritual ruling powers—are daily learning this lesson more thoroughly. They must put their house in order, and prepare to give up every unlawful dominion over the souls and bodies of men. *The just and high demands of men, based on truth, must be granted.* Let all men understand this:—those who will blindly attempt to resist the onward course of truth and right, moving on now with such great power, will be borne down and swept away by the torrent.

There is no greater want and no more inalienable right of men than that of having the word of God given to them in their own languages, as correctly as possible reproduced from the originals; so, also, there is no more unwarranted assumption than for any class of men, Protestant or Catholic, to claim to have this divine treasure, in any respect, in their exclusive

keeping, and to give it to men in a manner and form as may suit them best—binding and loosing the word of God, according to their own judgment and will. "The Word of God is not" thus "bound." Every man under the heavens has an equal right in it—a full right to the whole of it. It belongs to the humblest man on earth, as much as to the Pope of Rome, to the Primate of England, or to any body of Catholic or Protestant scholars and divines on earth. None of these have any right to say to men, "We have this book in our charge; thus, it is *ours*; and we shall dispense it to you as seems to us best." No! we deny that the Bible is thus *in trust* granted to any peculiar class; it is mine, it is yours, it is everybody's alike, free as the air and the sunlight of heaven.

It is the right and the duty of every man to demand that this Word of Life shall be given to him in his own tongue as free from error as possible, and it is the consequent duty of those to whom God has in His providence given the ability, so to give it to him,

And such is the demand of the intelligent Christian world now, and this demand can no longer be ignored and refused. The grounds of this demand are too strong, and now too well understood, to admit of being quietly put aside. It is well known that the text of the original tongues from which the early translations in the various modern languages were made, was imperfect, and that we have now a much more perfect one. This alone would be sufficient to demand a revision of the old versions. But furthermore, it is also known that our knowledge now of the original tongues—the Hebrew and the Greek, especially the former—is much more perfect than two or three centuries ago. And finally, it is a notorious fact now, acknowledged by all eminent scholars who have given any attention to the matter, that the present current versions are burdened, defaced and weakened by numerous errors, and often of such moment that they imperatively call for correction. The very weak reasons for delaying indefinitely the work of a correct version, are gradually losing their influence, except with the over-cautious, the prejudiced, the ignorant, the fearful and unbelieving.

The demands for corrected versions of the Bible are being made with effect all over the Protestant world. It has become a great, living, irrepressible question in Germany, France, England, and America, and all these nations are moving forward in the work. In Europe the movement is not in the interest of any special sect or party; it is a question in which, with all freedom, the first scholars and theologians are making themselves heard. Protestant Germany and France are actively engaged in a very thorough examination of their popular versions, and in preparing the way for a general revision or re-translation. In America sect-life is so much more intense, that thought is much less free within the bounds of the evangelical religious parties than it is in the great Protestant churches of the old world. The difference in this respect is very marked between the old world and the new.

The *Revue Chretienne*, of Paris, for June, brings us a notice of what the Protestant churches of France and Geneva were doing in translating anew the Bible, and gives a review of some of the first fruits of this work, in new translations of the prophet Isaiah. We take the liberty of giving our readers the introduction of the article in the *Revue*:

"Our age is earnestly devoted to the profound studies of languages, and of comparative literatures. Never, as in our day, have languages, and especially those of the ancient peoples, been so thoroughly studied, and their literatures so philosophically treated. To the erudition of the six-

teenth and seventeenth centuries is added, by the moderns, a critical spirit and a power of wonderful penetration ; and by the profound study of the primitive elements of language, the horizon of linguistic knowledge has been extended far beyond the limits assigned by ancient science. Applied to the language of the Old Testament, this method of proceeding has enabled us to advance much farther in the understanding of Hebrew ; and in furnishing us with new hermeneutical means, opens to us a new era in the science of Biblical interpretation. Up to the end of the fifteenth century, the Jews were almost the only ones that gave any serious attention to Hebrew. At this epoch the scientific apparatus, the lexicons and grammars, existed only in Hebrew and Arabic, and it was from the mouth of the teachers of the Synagogue, and at great expense, that a few learned men among Christians were enabled to make use of this tongue. In the first part of the sixteenth century the study of Hebrew was widely extended in Europe, and beginning with the Reformation period, which coincided with this revival of the modern mind called the *renaissance*, the dialect of the Old Testament was placed in the rank of the classical tongues and studied with the same ardour, especially by Protestants, who up to our day have remained the masters in this branch of philology.

"In consequence of the part it assigned to the Bible in its religious system, the Reformation was led to study thoroughly the original languages of the Scriptures ; but at the moment when it went to work at this task, the science of which it made use to procure versions from the original texts, was yet of but recent date ; and besides this—at least as far as the Hebrew was concerned—this science was but a borrowed thing from strangers, on whose testimony the scholars of that day were obliged to rest, without being yet able to judge of it and master it themselves. Furthermore, what was known at this epoch of the ancient Orient, of its manners, genius, its literature ? Philology, as a science, was yet to be born ; linguistics was yet but the empirical study of languages, a study based on the traditional idea, handed down from the Fathers of the church, that the Hebrew was the primitive language of humanity—*linguarum matrix*, and that all the other tongues had been derived from it.

"The situation of the new Hebraists at that time resembled much that of the small number of scholars in Europe, who at the beginning of our century devoted themselves to Sanscrit literature. For a long time the latter were obliged to yield a docile confidence to the Asiatic School of Calcutta, which itself wrote under the dictation of the Brahmins, on the good faith of whom it was obliged to rely while awaiting the moment when it would be able itself to master their knowledge.

"Protestant France occupied from the very beginning an important place in the scientific movement of the sixteenth century. In Hebrew, especially, it had no need of envying Germany, which has since become the classic ground of Hebrew science. The version of Luther, finished in 1534, preceded only by a year that of Olivetan, our first Protestant French translator, whose work, several times revised, the last time by Ostervald, has become the version most generally used in our churches.

"For a long time doubts have been raised as to the fidelity of this version, especially in the Old Testament part of it. These doubts ended in becoming positive affirmations, of a nature to compromise among us the authority of this portion of the Holy Scriptures. Hence the desire expressed by competent men of replacing this ancient and too defective translation by a new one, or at least of having it carefully revised and corrected. But as long as they addressed themselves to the Bible Societies,

these wishes remained unanswered, and this could not be otherwise. The Bible Societies have been in this last awakening of the church, one of the fairest and most beneficent institutions of our Protestantism;—their committees, composed of the most respected men among us, have rendered invaluable service to the evangelical cause. But it is not from them that our churches must expect the accomplishment of a work so important as that of a new version, nor even of a satisfactory revision of the ancient versions. This work is not within their competence; they have received no charge or authority of this from our churches, which have committed to them no other mission than that of disseminating versions accepted by use.

"We await impatiently the moment when our churches will be able to give themselves a new translation, especially of the Old Testament, and we are following with the liveliest interest the labours of modern science, that every day brings us the materials proper to facilitate the task of those who will be regularly charged to prepare this work, the need of which is every day more and more felt. For, as to a revision of Martin and Ostervald, that is not to be thought of. As to the historic books, their text is far too defective for us to undertake to amend them by simple corrections; an entire new version must come in their place. This was well understood at Neuchatel, at Lausanne, and at Geneva, and finally also at Paris. We possess already the complete text of Perret-Gentil—the three others are in course of publication. Before long we shall have before us four entirely new versions of the Old Testament.

"These incessant efforts of the church to obtain a good translation of the Bible, testify both of the steadfastness of its faith in the Holy Scriptures, and its confidence in science, by the aid of which it hopes to succeed in daily better appropriating to itself their contents."

Such is a specimen of the free, liberal spirit in which French Protestants discuss the important questions of old and new translations of the Scriptures. What a contrast this is to the narrow-minded way in which the American sects generally discuss this subject. Indeed we may say, they do not even, in any noteworthy manner, venture to *discuss* it at all. What freedom, what courage of faith, what confidence in Bible truth and science on the one side,—what unmanly, narrow sect-fear and sect-prejudice and slavish cowardice on the other! In the face of the now notorious facts of the defectiveness of the original texts from which the king's version was made, and the immense progress now made in that direction; and, finally, of the many evident and often not unimportant errors of it,—if you talk of a revision of the common version, at once, among these *enlightened free* Protestants, that look with compassion on the spiritual bondage of the Romanist, there is the most fearful alarm;—"distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth:—for the powers of heaven shall be shaken." With blanched faces and pale lips,—pale with fear and anger,—they cry out, "Not yet! not yet! Let errors numberless, let ancient wrongs, let darkness on the word of God abide, rather than have a moment's disturbance of our old, old, old quiet!" And yet this quiet will not be granted. The awakened spirit of man, thirsting for light and truth, and strong in its confidence in truth and in its own strength, and bold in the assertion of right, will go on in its work of dispelling darkness and righting wrongs and error, let the weak, fearful victims of old prejudices groan and tremble as they may. God and free humanity, for the grand consummation of their work, cannot wait for such people.—*Millennial Harbinger*.

PERSONAL RELIGION.

(FROM AN ADDRESS, TO THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION, BY HENRY SIMON).

FROM what we have said, it is manifest that there can be no deeply religious life apart from concern for the well-being of the entire society of which the individual is but a unit. As long as the religious life expresses itself in mere self-concern to escape the penalty of wrong-doing, and to secure happiness, it is in the very first stage of existence—unintelligent, weak, and half selfish. To cultivate this condition as the end of thought and endeavour would be to produce a form of selfishness, which would be the more hideous because spiritual. That which is appropriate enough for the infant would be intolerable and pitiable in the man. The real fulness of personal piety in multitudes of professedly Christian people results from an unwise care of self. They have become spiritual epicures. They have gloried in the Cross of Christ as a grand theatrical display of justice and mercy, and have selfishly watched the lamb of God, not bearing away the sin, but the consequences of the sin of the world. Into the deeper mystery they have not cared to enter. "To be crucified with Christ" is simply to watch the crucifixion, or to accept it as a historical fact. The chief questions asked are those which relate to their own comfort and ease. Where shall I get good? not where shall I do good? is the first enquiry. The getting good resolves itself, in not a few cases, into a question as to where the most pleasurable sensations can be obtained, or the most perfect echo of cherished opinions heard, at a moderate, *very* moderate, cost. Not, who will lead me into the awful mystery of the death of Christ, that, through dying to self, I may live to Him? As long as the spiritual life concerns itself supremely with itself, it will be stunted, and feeble, and fruitless. Undue self-concern is the shutting out of light and air, and the forbidding of expansion. The healthy instincts of this life, such as hunger and thirst for truth, may be depended upon as sufficient to regulate a wise self-concern. . . . The self-indulgent man can never be spiritual. When we go to be taught of God, there must be a fasting from or a dying to our thoughts, although they have been given to us by God, and are His thoughts. This is essential, that these very thoughts may live and grow. To stereotype thought is to abandon it to cobweb and mildew, and to starve the very life out of it. We must be empty, to be filled afresh with the Divine thought. The self-opinionated man can never be spiritual, be he minister, or deacon, or private member. The highest things are kept from the wise and prudent, and are revealed only to babes. There must be also fasting from our own wills, that God's will might be done. God is ever working upon chaos. Our wills must be broken ere the will of God can be apprehended and done by us. The self-willed man can never be spiritual it is then, brethren and fathers, that the sublime expressions of apostles and prophets, which are to many of us no better than a jumble of fine sounds, will become instinct with life and meaning, and breathe a heavenly music, while they express our oneness with the rich experience of "the men of whom the world was not worthy," and not less our oneness with Him who is the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.

THE CAUSE OF MANY EVILS.

Worldly men say, "*business is business.*" That formula is supposed to be a kind of sufficient reason for any cruel pressure or unscrupulous dealing that circumstances may seem to require. Not a few professedly good men have given in their assent and consent to that formula; if not their

"unfeigned assent and consent." That a man professes to be a Christian is no reason in the business world why he should be trusted. It is in many quarters a half-reason why a better inquiry should be made concerning his antecedents. There is a kind of unwritten business code which differs from that which should regulate the private life. Many justify themselves in adopting this code when they pass to the shop and the warehouse by saying rather loudly to themselves that it is utterly impossible to embody the high morality that is preached to us in our every-day life, if we are to succeed. It is just here that the mistake is made. Men suppose that their first duty is to succeed, and that their second duty is to do right if they can. The first duty of the disciple of Christ is to do right, and he is to take for granted that he will succeed. What if the world calls it failure; it may be notwithstanding a sublime success. Our Lord failed, as the world would say, and yet His is the sublimest success. There are many men who do not fully believe in God, nor do they fully believe in Mammon; and yet because they expect something from both, they try to serve both. It is an impossible task. It is a question whether the difficulty which so many have found to be "sincere and without offence" in the business world has not been increased by the form in which the truth has been too exclusively put. Have we not been insisting too much upon the form of sound words, and not equally upon the imperishable spirit? To some it must have appeared that their minds were to be hung round with passages of Scripture like the school-rooms of children, and ever and anon they were to be glancing at this passage and that in their work; and they have then said, "Impossible." Of course it is impossible. And if it were possible, it would not be profitable. The Spirit of Christ ought to underlie the whole life. The business life ought to be instinct with the religious life, and unconsciously we ought to be doing right and seeking righteousness. The true artist unconsciously embodies the principles of art in his work; and because he unconsciously embodies them, he paints truly. And it is only as we *thus* embody the principles of truth in our life will our work be truly done in the business world and in all other places. One cannot imagine anything more beautiful than a business world permeated with the light of truth and righteousness.

That the business world to-day is no better than it should be admits of no manner of doubt. Those who know it best have the saddest tales to tell respecting it. Thank God there are multitudes of honourable men in the business world, and they are its salvation. But, notwithstanding, many of the revelations which the last few years have brought to light have been anything but consoling and assuring. The enormous extent to which the puffing system has grown implies a vast system of adulteration and roguery. The bitter disputes which arise between masters and men—the grasping of the one and the grasping of the other—are deeply saddening. The presence among us of fraudulent speculators, and the cry for cheapness, are not comforting symptoms. The use, the only use which the business world is being put to by multitudes—a place to get rich in by any means, if you can—is fraught with mischief. When, in the presence of all this, you refer to the highest consideration, there is a loud cry, "Impossible, impossible, in this day of competition." In the presence of all this, we ought to look one or two facts in the face. In proportion as the business world is being ruled on the principle, "every man for himself," it is being hurried to destruction. A society held together by the principle of selfish men is rotten. We are told every day, "business is very stagnant." Why is it stagnant? People do not seem disposed to invest their money. And

why are people not disposed to invest their money? Because public confidence is shaken, and thus we have now and again a chaotic condition of things, and men's hearts failing them, for fear of the things which are coming upon the earth, which is themselves. The family life cannot be surrounded by a keen bleak atmosphere of this kind without being affected by it. The father will bring the contagion home in his own hindered life, and the nation will also suffer. There is this other thought—that here as elsewhere we must have martyrs—men who are willing to become poor and to be poor, to establish commercial integrity, and to lay more widely and deeply the foundations of the kingdom of righteousness in the business world. There were martyrs needed to establish Christian doctrine in the world. The universal establishment of Christian practice is awaiting its martyrs. "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service."

THE CONCLUSION OF THE WHOLE MATTER.

The national aspect of this subject points in the direction of the cosmopolitan, and the cosmopolitan in the direction of the universal and infinite. The spiritual man feels that in yielding himself to Christ he is brought into fellowship with the whole family in earth and heaven, that he has come into oneness with "an innumerable company of angels, with the general assembly and church of the first-born which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirit of just men made perfect." Thus this life, which manifests itself, first of all, in the personal, springs up through all the relationships of life until it loses itself in the eternal and infinite, and from visible regions it gathers new strength, which comes back through every relationship, making the cosmopolitan rich and strong, the national more truly patriotic, the business honourable and true, the family tender and beautiful, and the personal unselfish and robust. You have watched the sun in yonder sky attract the waters of the ocean until the heavens have been covered with clouds, which in time pour their contents upon the thirsty land, causing streams to break forth in the desert, and rivers to burst from mountain fastnesses, and a thousand rivulets to sport and laugh amid the fertility and beauty to which they have contributed. So Christ, who is the Sun of Righteousness in the heaven of heavens above us, attracts the life which manifests itself, first of all, in the personal, but which has its source in the boundless ocean of the eternal love, through all the relations of life, until the heavens of infinity become filled with Divine aspirations, and hopes, which, like the clouds, pour their enriching influence through all life's relationships, making them blossom with a divine beauty, and filling them with the fruits of righteousness which are by Christ Jesus to the praise and glory of God.

THE DISESTABLISHMENT OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

It is significant to find that, even at this early period, Mr. MIALl's proposed motion for the Disestablishment of the English Church is attracting considerable public attention. We give, in another column, some illustrations of this; but, perhaps, the most noteworthy is to be found in the *North British Daily Mail*, the leading daily journal in the west of Scotland. In its number for the 24th of October, the *Mail* remarks that the winter

campaign of the Liberation Society includes, at least one striking item. It says:—

"An attempt is to be made to at once raise the whole question of Church Establishments, in the most direct and decisive way, by introducing resolutions or a bill into the House of Commons, and by a particularly vigorous agitation throughout the country. Mr. MIALl has already pledged himself to lead the attack in Parliament, and the Society is fully prepared to conduct the agitation outside. The news will be received in some quarters with a shout of derision, but it is at least just worth mentioning that the man who in a few months will move for the disestablishment of the English State-Church, and who will of course, be left at first in an apparently hopeless minority, is the very man who, years ago, moved, with the same result, the disestablishment of the Irish State-Church. To say the least of it, this is ominous. There is a tough persistency in English dissent which is singularly effective in carrying out a policy based on even-handed justice and respect for the doctrine of civil and religious equality. Its victories have been unbroken and decisive during a long struggle of two hundred years. They have often been deferred, but they have never been ultimately prevented or even spoiled. Once 'moved,' then, in the House, we shall probably never hear the last of it till the work be done. Session after session, Parliament after Parliament, the sifting process will go on, till, as in the case of the Church in Ireland, the right men are found in their places. The debates on the disestablishment of the Church in Ireland assuredly cleared the way for the discussion of the more serious and vital question, and principles were laid down and statements made in these debates which will come to light again in an amazing way when they are wanted. It is true that Mr. GLADSTONE has been careful to guard himself with saving clauses, securing the vested interests of the Established Church in England; but we shall be greatly surprised if when the time comes, he is not made to carry shot and shell for the enemy."

This is such a reading from the outside, of the position and the prospects of the campaign before us, that might really have been written within the circle of the Liberation party. Expressions of opinion of this character will multiply, and if people believe as this writer does, in our ultimate success, half the battle will have been won.

There appear to be other Churchmen who look upon this intended motion with mingled apprehension and hope. Thus, at the Conference of the Church Association, held at Liverpool on the 26th of October, the Rev. Dr. TAYLOR remarked that

"He looked forward with concern to the assault that in three or six months would certainly be opened upon the Established Church, with a view, as had been threatened, of meeting out the same measure of justice as had been administered to the Irish Church. Circumstances might also arise in which it would be their duty to secede, not individually, but in a body, taking out with them all the resources of the Establishment, not leaving them to be made use of by the enemy—a capitulation, in fact, with all the honours of war, taking their departure amid banners flying and drums beating."

Then the *Church Review* describes the present position as intolerable. In its issue of October 22, we read:—

"We have here, in fact, the chief source of difficulty in the present relations of Church and State. The Church has no longer to deal with an individual sovereign, who, although not personally belonging to her Communion, may politically act in her interest. The State is now practically republican. Parliament, which is supreme, is made up of individuals, many of whom avowedly act for the destruction of the Church's faith. Can the Church, without a breach of the divine law, submit, even in indifferent matters to ecclesiastical enactments made by such a power? If we argue logically from the principles of the old Erastians, it would follow that she cannot. How much more emphatically would non-Erastians have disallowed such a position? And hence we see how by the progress of constitutional changes the Church has been landed in a position from which even in the worst times she would have shrunk back as being intolerable and unlawful."

The Established Church in Scotland may go even before that of England. "It is satisfactory to find so 'canny' a member of Parliament and Statesman as Mr. BRUCE, referring, in an extremely unexcitable manner, to the possibility of the disestablishment of the Scottish Church. Of

course Mr. BRUCE will not propose a motion having such an object as that in view, but then he indicates that he, perhaps, might not oppose it, and tells us upon what conditions a Government can introduce such a measure. His remarks, made at Greenock, where these :—

‘To disestablish the Church of Scotland, where the feelings and wishes of the people of Scotland were fairly and strongly expressed, there could be little doubt that Parliament would give effect to their wishes. It seemed to him that at present there was a very divided state of opinion. The Established Church, undoubtedly, no longer represented, as it once did, the immense majority of the people of Scotland; and, therefore, all the arguments that could formerly be urged in favour of an Establishment no longer existed. On the other hand, the Established Church of Scotland was not like the Established Church which there was in Ireland—an insult to the feelings and opinions of the great majority of the people; and he was not sure that all those who dissented from the Established Church of Scotland were anxious that that Church should be overthrown. At any rate there did not seem to be that unanimity, and that strong prevalence of feeling, which could alone justify a Government in introducing a measure so important as that which was pointed at in this matter.’

The information given in these remarks is, of course, not very new. When the nation has decided upon a certain political action, it commonly follows that the Government decides upon the same action. Mr. BRUCE, however, gets a little closer to the particular question at issue than this. He says that, in his judgment, there is not sufficient unanimity in Scotland in favour of disestablishment. Will our Scottish friends weigh this?"

The Liberator.

EVER WITH THE LORD.

"And so shall we be for ever with the Lord."—1 Thess. iv. 17.

THIS being for ever with the Lord will be the fruition of some of the fondest and brightest hopes of the Christian. It will be the fulfilment of one of the exceeding great and precious promises of our Lord. It will be the answer to our Lord's recorded prayers, and it will be the accomplishment of the object, or at least part of the end, alike of Christ's absence and of His second coming. "I go" said He, "to prepare a place for you, and if I go and prepare a place for you I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am ye may be also." "Father," said Jesus, in that wonderful prayer recorded by the evangelist, John xvii., "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am." "If any man serve me let him follow me, and where I am there also shall my servant be." The Apostles had laid hold of these glorious truths, especially Paul. We find that these truths were embodied in his desires and expectations. Hence we find him writing, "We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and be present with the Lord. I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better." Then, in the above words, he seeks to comfort the troubled ones in the Thessalonian Church, by reminding them of the time when their redemption would be consummated, and they would find themselves in the presence of the Lord for ever!

Let us glance at the context for a moment. "I would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning those who sleep in Jesus, that ye sorrow not even as others who have no hope." The Apostle does not forbid sorrow, but desires that sorrow may be checked and chastened by other feelings. We commit no sin when we stand by the grave of loved ones and weep. O no! Jesus wept! And we may weep also. The teaching of the New Testament does not prevent our tears, but tends to govern, to

modify, and sanctify them. We are to sorrow not as others who have no hope. The Apostle furnishes us with the reason. He speaks of something that will help to dry up our tears and fill us with joy and holy resignation. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him; for the Lord himself shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God. And the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air. AND SO SHALL WE EVER BE WITH THE LORD."

In what sense shall we be with the Lord? Referring to the present state, Jesus said "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. Lo! I am with you always, even to the end of the world." Just mark the phraseology. In the one case we are told that we shall be with the Lord; in the other, "I am in the midst of them." Now Christ is with us in His word; we have His spirit dwelling with us; it is the Christian's portion to enjoy His ever-abiding presence. But the time is coming when we shall be in His actual presence, and see Him face to face. Faith is precious, but what must sight be? To gaze upon that thorn-crowned brow—to behold those hands and feet that were pierced for us—to see Him as He is, and to be made like Him—What! O what will it be?

"There shall we see His face,
And never, never sin.
From the rich treasures of His grace
Drink endless pleasure in."

In this sense shall we be ever with our precious Lord.

Where shall we be for ever with the Lord? In a place prepared by Himself. We may form some faint idea of the place when we remember the glory, dignity, and excellency of Jesus. It will be a place prepared by Him who is the fairest among ten thousand, and the altogether lovely. A place designed by the genius of His love, built up by the energy of His power, enriched by the resources of His wealth, adapted to us by the depth of His knowledge and wisdom. Especially is it a place designed by the genius of His love—that love which passeth knowledge. We have all seen places prepared by love to receive objects of love. Often have we looked into the home prepared for the bride. Why are there so many beauteous and attractive objects in it? What has led to the thought of them? What has moved to the purchase of them? What has placed them there? Why has there been so much thought to make that home pleasant and attractive, so that when the being for whom it is prepared crosses the threshold it shall seem to say to her, Come in, and stay, and rest. We have often seen places prepared by love to receive objects of love, and we have often felt that love has a wonderful genius in designing and contriving, and a wondrous fertility in enriching and adorning. Now this is enough for us to know, that the place where we shall be for ever with the Lord is a place prepared for us by Himself—a place made ready by the Saviour's love.

How long shall we be with the Lord? Always! So shall we ever. The word means *always*. Only a little time were His disciples with Him when He was upon earth. They were not with Him long enough to know Him. None of us are with each other long enough to know each other; not even those who are nearest and dearest to us. It is only when some loved one is taken from us, and we put the various passages of the life together and read them as one continuous and unbroken story, that we can know

what that life has been. While we are living together in the bustle of our existence we do not, we cannot, completely know each other. The time is too short, and there is too much to do calmly, quietly, and dispassionately, without prejudice, to read each other. Only, I say, a little while were the disciples with Jesus. They knew little of His form; they knew little of His face; they knew less of His heart. They were just like men in danger, grasping the hand of a benefactor who comes to them in thick smoke or dense clouds, and stretches out his hand so that those who are in jeopardy may seize it and be saved by it. The change represented here is marvellously great. "*So shall we ever be with the Lord.*" Only a little time are we with each other. If, for example, I see a husband and wife who have been with each other sixty years, and who have lived as husband and wife ought to live, they speak of the time as short; they speak of it as only a little time. And if the tie that binds them together were to be preserved through another sixty or seventy years, they would still speak of the time as only a little time. Let this fact by contrast bring out the force of the Apostle's words, "*So shall we ever be with the Lord.*" In view of this state of unchangeableness the followers of Jesus are called pilgrims, strangers—having no continuing city, but seeking one to come. This present is not our home. No home this side Heaven does the Christian recognize as home. That place cannot be thoroughly home in which death may enter at any moment, and from which death may take away those who, after all, make the home. Not bricks and mortar and timber can make a home. Not marble, however fine and polished, can make a home. Not gold or silver or tapestry or painting can make a home. It is that which makes Heaven that makes a home even on this earth. It is love that makes a home. To love and to be loved, though it be in the peasant's cot—though it be in the rudest barn, through the fissures of which the wind makes music, is to be at home; and often we find homes in the rudest dwellings and none in the most splendid palaces. But where love is likely to be disturbed, where some rude hand can take the threads that love is ever spinning and tying and fastening, and cut them and sever them, the home feeling must of course be partial; and we long for a place and a state where those whom we love will never be taken from us, and where we shall know that we shall abide eternally in the presence of those who love us. No change, no parting, no farewell, but we shall be for ever with the Lord and with each other.

What will be the result of this being ever with the Lord? What is the blessedness that shall result from this perpetual presence with the Lord? Occasional absence is desirable between man and man. One secret of living happy and advantageously with our fellows is to have spaces (if I may use the term) between the seasons of our intercourse. This will, I think, hold good in both parents and children. But while this applies most thoroughly and entirely to our intercourse with each other, yet it has no application here. To be always with the Lord is to be always blessed by the Lord and to be always the object of His complacency. If with the Lord we shall see Him as He is. If with the Lord we shall be made like Him. If with the Lord we shall have unbroken fellowship with Him. If with the Lord we shall have a sign and a token of our eternal salvation. If with the Lord we shall have the advantage of His ceaseless ministrations. The Lamb who is in the midst of the throne shall lead us to fountains of living waters, and God shall wipe away all tears from our eyes. For ever with the Lord. All that is involved in being with the

Lord will be for *ever*. Life eternal—for ever ; light unfading—for ever ; love unchanging—for ever ; peace, joy, rest—all for ever !

When shall we be for ever with the Lord ? At the glorious morn of the resurrection. "When Jesus, who is our life, appears, then shall we also appear with him in glory ;" or in other words, then shall we be for ever with Him. He has gone to prepare the home. "In my Father's house are many mansions." "I go to prepare a place for you." In His absence we have a promise that sustains and comforts us—a promise that stimulates us to persevere and press forward amid trials and difficulties—a promise that enables us to rejoice in affliction, and sing even in adversity. It is this:—"I will come again and take you to myself." Hence, when He comes again and takes us to Himself, we shall be for ever with Him. Consequently, we look for His coming. It is the hope of the Church—the *blessed* hope—the *one* hope of the *one* body. May we be ready when He comes ! May we who have this hope purify ourselves even as Christ is pure ! "Let us, who are of the day, be sober ; putting on the breastplate of faith and love, and for an helmet the hope of salvation, for God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep we should live together with Him." Well may the Apostle add, "Wherefore, comfort one another with these words." What could be more comforting ? Nothing else can so comfort us as to know that the time is coming when there shall be no more death ; when all in Jesus shall be restored ; when we shall be beyond the power of death and the grave, and be able exultingly to say, "O death ! where is thy sting ? O grave ! where is thy victory ?" In the prospect of such a glorious era as this we are able to face grim death with holy boldness, and look at the dreary grave with calmness and undismay. My reader, have you had to stand by the grave of loved ones, and commit them to the dust ? Take comfort from this glorious truth, "They that sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him," and they shall be for *ever* with the Lord.

"For ever with the Lord !

Amen, so let it be ;

Life from the dead is in that word—

'Tis immortality.

Here, in the body pent,

Absent from Him I roam ;

Yet nightly pitch my moving tent

A day's march nearer home."

Brighton.

B. ELLIS.

AN OLD STORY.

No pregnant thought or speech of bards or of sages hoary
 Ever set forth in power the sadness of the story ;
 Beyond what the heart can conceive or the tongue can declare,
 Is the labour and toil from the earth to the burdened air.
 No spirit can truly grasp, no mouth can utter the pain,
 Or tell the grief and unrest of works which are done in vain.
 Amid hopes which burn to ashes, and fears which are fulfilled,
 How the human heart is shaken, and the wine of life is spilled !
 Can we find any quiet under the clover sod ?
 Still there remaineth a rest for the people of God.

How storm and calm alternate—how life and death keep weaving
A mystic coloured robe, which the loom is never leaving !
The wind comes whispering forth from olden secret cave,
And soon among mountain pines is madly heard to rave.
Whether it softly sigh where orient spices sleep,
Or roar among the breakers of the roused infuriate deep,
After all its circuits it returneth back again,
And in the fashion old we reckon our loss or gain.
Did it minister life, or was it an iron rod ?
Still there remaineth a rest for the people of God.

What do we see as we rise on eagle pinion,
And range at will throughout the finite dominion ?
Lo ! the great rivers shine, and flow to the sea evermore,
And backward return as the billows surmount the shore.
The great procession on high is an endless show,
And the central fire has fuel for ever below.
Likewise the human swarm is in continual march,
Digging desolate graves or building triumphal arch !
Is the creature divine, or is he only a clod ?
Still there remaineth a rest for the people of God.

Was there not a realm of inviolate grace and splendour,
Which the earth-born king lost by cowardly surrender ?
There was a period, surely, when nature seemed divine,
Sleeping in God, whose face serene over all did shine.
There was glory in the grass and rapture in the stream,
Like landscapes in the prophet's trance or poet's solemn dream !
When the charm of holy light from the darkness arose sublime,
How supremely bright and fair the hues of that golden prime.
But see—the discrowned Lord in the wilderness plod !
Still there remaineth a rest for the people of God.

Now sunshine and falling showers from earth distil the foison ;
But the grain is black, and the wine vat runs with poison !
The gates were closed in thunder, the fiery sword doth sweep
No road into lost Eden, whether we clamour or weep.
The battle, with storm and plague, with darkness and winter's breath,
With disease and pain, and the terrible Angel of Death !
What a war it is ! As the tragical ages roll,
The wail drawn out, and the dirge prolonged from soul to soul !
Forces of evil strength are marshalled and grimly shod—
Still there remaineth a rest for the people of God.

High over head there are spiritual forms contending ;
On earth the mountains shake, and ancient rocks are rending !
From factories, grim with smoke, to fields of devouring fire,
What strife and wintry brawl—what sloughs of evil mire !
Temple and palace look strong, but the winds of vengeance arise,
And pitiless flame descends from lowering rifted skies !
Thrones and dynasties sweep like phantoms over the stage,
Councils and priesthoods follow, convulsed with fear and rage !
Still, in a city where marauding feet never trod—
Still there remaineth a rest for the people of God.

The suffering has no voice, the sorrow cannot be spoken
 Of souls that long endure, or of hearts that are lost or broken !
 What coils of endless rope, as the bucket goes
 Down into empty wells ; what gathering woes,
 As the houses we built are swept away by the wave,
 And the forms we chase and clasp breathe on us like the grave !
 There was radiance and fire, with purple and gold so grand,
 But disenchantment came in the grey and desert land.
 But yet the amaranth blooms ! There is an eternal abode !
 Still there remaineth a rest for the people of God.

G. G.

DEBATE ON CHRISTIANITY AND SECULARISM.

CHRISTIANITY *versus* SECULARISM.

ON Tuesday evening, Oct. 25th, the public discussion between D. King and C. Bradlaugh was resumed at Bury. Mr. Bradlaugh intimated that in consequence of throat affection he could only continue the discussion during two of the five nights for which arrangements had been made. Three propositions remained to be discussed :—Oct. 25th and 26th, *What are the legitimate effects of Christianity ?* 27th and 28th, *What is Secularism, and what can it do for man that Christianity cannot ?* 29th, *Is the Bible account of creation opposed to reason and science ?* All these questions could not, of course, be taken up in two nights ; and as the past four nights had been given to Christianity, it was, very properly, decided that the remaining evenings be devoted to Secularism.

Mr. Bradlaugh, in opening the discussion, undertook to show first of all what Secularism is. We were told that in one sense Secularism is a system and, in another sense, no system at all. It is not fixed and fast, but on the contrary, constantly changing. It would not be the same ten years hence that it is to-day. It could not, therefore, be easily defined. He then proceeded to state what Secularism could do for man which Christianity could not. The substance of his remarks on this part of the proposition is embodied in the principles of the National Secular Society, which he read to the meeting.

Mr. King, in following, pointed out the fact that his opponent had utterly failed to define Secularism. Mr. Bradlaugh had told them that Secularism is one thing now and that it might be very different, in many particulars, ten years hence. But he (Mr. King) wished to know what it *now* is ; not what it will be ten years hence. He then went on to show what Secularism logically (according to Mr. Bradlaugh) is—**ATHEISM**. The principles of the National Secular Society were also taken up, and it was most conclusively demonstrated that those principles were *not distinctively* atheistic. Many Christians could and did go in for all the principles enunciated, or could do so without compromising their religious convictions in the slightest. Secularism, therefore, had nothing distinctively considered, except Atheism—that is, as defined by Mr. Bradlaugh. Mr. King also called attention to the impure and immoral nature of Secularist literature. Mr. Barker and Mr. Holyoake had both been associated with Mr. Bradlaugh in conducting the *National Reformer*, and both these gentlemen declared that they had been compelled to give up their connection with that paper on the ground of the filthy and abominable things which Mr.

Bradlaugh persisted in pressing into it. Other books were named, most debasing and demoralizing in their nature and tendency, which, notwithstanding were commended by Mr. Bradlaugh and widely circulated by Secularists. It was extremely painful to myself, and no doubt to many others, to have such literature brought forward at all; but Secularism can never be fully known apart from the literature it recommends and circulates, and true and noble minds have but to see or hear what Secularists inculcate and commend to turn from the whole with utter loathing and contempt.

Yes! It has been shown what Secularism really is. It has also been clearly shown what Secularism can do which Christianity cannot. Secularism can bring into contempt the holiest institutions of social life. It can sap the foundations of virtue and morality, it can pander to the vicious and depraved tastes of fallen humanity, and render men more vicious still. It can cast its malign shadow across the young man's path until, under its withering, blasting influence, everything within him of hope and promise has been destroyed. It has robbed many a noble heart and home of peace and happiness and joy; and given in return, cold negations and a literature which one can scarcely touch without being defiled. Those things, which Christianity is too holy and too pure to do, Secularism *can* do and *has* done, as too many, alas, are able to testify.

Mr. Bradlaugh, in closing, wished to know whether even *one* convert had been made to Christianity by the debate. Now, be this as it may, one thing an observer, less keen by far than Mr. Bradlaugh, could not fail to perceive during those two nights was, how feebly he was supported by his own friends. While inveighing against Christianity during the first four nights his party cheered him on; but when Secularism was assailed, and its champion, instead of boldly and bravely expounding and defending it, spent his time in vilifying and abusing his opponent, the subdued and cowed temper of the Secularist party betrayed the latent consciousness that their cause was losing ground. Secularism, has, unquestionably, been thoroughly unmasked, and the awful exposure of its infamous doctrines must prove damaging in the extreme to the cause of infidelity in Bury. Mr. Bradlaugh himself seemed to feel this, for, during the last evening, he did not whine very much like the whipped cur, spoken of a month ago, it would be difficult to know what Secularists mean by whining.

On the first evening Mr. Bradlaugh avowed his determination to drive Mr. King off the platform. Instead of this, however, he himself has been compelled to retire. And in closing this article I would recommend to his special consideration the following words, found in the book he so much despises—"Let not him that bucketh on his armour boast himself as he that putteth it off." The discussion has thus, at his instance, been left unfinished; and whether he will ever resume it again remains to be seen.

J. STRANG.

THE DEBATE ON SECULARISM.

FRESH from the arena, with a vivid recollection of what we saw and heard there, the following particulars are chronicled in the hope that they will be interesting to many who were unable to be present at the discussion.

This debate has been looked forward to with considerable interest, and perhaps, with a little pardonable anxiety, by many who recognized the importance of the subjects to be debated, and the qualifications and antecedents of the respective disputants. We say pardonable anxiety, not

that we feared the result of a properly conducted contest between truth and error, in which only fair weapons would be used; not that we had any lack of confidence in the ability of our "defender of the faith;" but, remembering the cunning artfulness sometimes manifested by professional and astute debaters, the well-known ability (of a certain kind) of the present opposer of the truth; knowing that our bulwarks would be rudely and powerfully assailed, and that unmeasured ridicule and contempt would fall upon the devoted head of the champion of truth, we confess that we anticipated a great struggle; and not feeling over confident that a triumphant victory would be achieved, we sent this petition to the Throne of Grace, "May God defend the right."

It seems doubtful if we shall have the debate as comprehensive and exhaustive as was contemplated when the terms were agreed to. It appears that Mr. Bradlaugh is suffering from an affection of the throat, and his physician considers it undesirable that he should debate five successive nights.

Of course we must admit the plea, but surely all who listened to Mr. Bradlaugh on the last two nights of the discussion will say, never before did a man who was suffering very severely indulge in such prolonged, noisy, vociferous declamation,—why, his violent efforts would damage a throat of brass; and the wish uppermost in our mind was, that he would husband a little of the strength which he was so wantonly wasting, and honourably fulfil his engagement.

A word as to the debaters. Seldom, if ever, was so striking a contrast observed between any two opponents, as was seen on this occasion between Mr. King and Mr. Bradlaugh. The former calm and kindly, patient almost to a fault, clear in statement, logically powerful, enduring without a murmur what to most men would have been terrible castigation, (although he is well known to possess formidable power of retaliation), and from first to last exhibiting the dignity and manners of a gentleman; but the latter, what words will describe him? Violent, madly abusive, and blasphemous. We watched, with intense suffering and eagerness, his changing countenance, his eye flashing deadly hatred, his lip curled with ineffable scorn and contempt, his threatening, defiant attitude, all indicating terrible earnestness, and unconquerable enmity, both to his opponent and to his opponent's cause; we were almost appalled by his withering sarcasm; and while his vehement declamation was ringing in our ears, we were carried breathless along as by a torrent, and forgot for the moment that we were not listening to the wrathful ebullitions of a Billingsgate fishwoman, but to the *arguments* of the President of the Secular Union.

Let it not be supposed that we are too severe, or do any injustice; cull a few choice expressions from Mr. Bradlaugh's speeches, and then say what man, with any sense of self-respect, can be solicited after this to meet an antagonist who descends to the use of language which no gentleman ever suffered to pass his lips.

"He thought this kind of weak stupidities had better be left out of the debate."

"He (Mr. King) had raised these 'elements' in what he knew to be a wickedly false way."

"It was the act of a mean, contemptible libeller."

"Mr. King in his heart knew how wickedly foul was the whole insinuation."

"The lie was contemptible and scoundrelly."

"Could there be a more contemptible specimen of lying by innuendo than that they had listened to from Mr. King?"

"It was wicked and deliberate lying and he should prove it."

"That was the character of his opponent's vileness; it only inclined into the lowest and filthiest parts, and took up that which was most congenial to its nature."

"A man contemptibly vile, without honour or honesty."

This is only a sample; but enough! It is the language of the gutter and the slum, and it must be added that it was the language used in public debate by *C. Bradlaugh, Esq., President of the Secular Union.*

The subject debated on the two nights was "What is Secularism, and what can it do for man that Christianity cannot?"

According to Mr. Bradlaugh, Secularism, although difficult to define, because it could not have any limited or definite programme which should be the same ten years hence as it is to-day, had certain broad and immutable principles, such as the following;—

1st. The promotion of human improvement and happiness is the highest duty.

2nd. The theological teachings of the world have been, and are, most powerfully obstructive of human improvement and happiness.

3rd. Morality; by which is meant, that which effects the greatest good to the greatest number with the least injury to any, should be sought and worked out by everybody professing to be enlisted under its banner.

4th. No one man can possibly give the truth upon all subjects, and very few bodies of men can give the whole truth upon any particular subject; therefore, to gather truth upon any subject, it must be gathered from all men, all ages, all sects, all churches.

What can Secularism do for man that Christianity cannot? Smile not, dear reader, Secularism can educate the masses, can improve the condition of the agricultural classes, abolish slavery, enfranchise and elevate woman, give civil liberty, freedom of speech, break the shackles of the press, and can establish co-operative institutions.

What does Mr. King reply? Secularism, as taught by Mr. Bradlaugh, has only one *peculiar* right, that is, to express opinions against Deity, and to disseminate atheism; its principal promoters are opposed to each other on questions fundamental; it has no code of morals to offer; it is degrading, it is demoralizing, and pernicious in its tendency. Says Mr. King, in effect, you Secularists coolly appropriate the legitimate results of Christianity, and unwarrantably attribute them to your teaching; as a Christian, I can, and I have, assisted in promoting the removal of civil and religious disabilities, and in the establishment and support of institutions which will advantage mankind; this is *my* work, quite as much as it is *yours*, then away with your cant as to what Secularism can do for man that Christianity cannot.

Reviewing the two nights' debate, we think there will scarcely be two opinions amongst us that Mr. King's attempt to unmask Secularism, and drag one of its apostles into the light of day, has been singularly successful; this much has certainly been accomplished: the corrupting tendency of literature commended by Mr. Bradlaugh is now known, and if the mephitic vapour arising from this filth should for a while longer poison the air, it will be known that one more voice has courageously raised an alarm which must eventually crush the evil.

Occupying the position he does, and taking his legitimate ground, Mr. King is simply invulnerable; the darts of the enemy glance from his shield as an arrow from a cylinder of burnished steel and, with him as an opponent, nothing is left to the Secularist debater but misappropriation, misrepresentation, abuse, and confusion.

WHY WAS THE DEBATE, AND WHAT ARE ITS RESULTS?

DURING the discussion Mr. Bradlaugh intimated that he ought to be considered as speaking the truth upon matters of fact within his own knowledge, unless there were proof to the contrary. We are prepared to adopt that rule in our intercourse with many persons, but certainly not with reference to him. The only rule applicable to him is, that his testimony shall be received when sustained by undeniable evidence. Several times during the discussion he set forth that we had challenged him to the Bury debate, and that it took place in consequence of our pushing it upon him. But he forgot that Mr. Slater, his chairman, told the truth on the first night when he said, "You will bear in mind, those of you who attended a lecture delivered about nine months ago by Mr. Bradlaugh, that a challenge was thrown out. It was repeated at a second course of lectures; and this debate is the result of those challenges." Subsequently, too, Mr. Slater declared that the challenge was given by the Secularists, in that hall, and accepted by Mr. Martin for us. So, then, Mr. King did not challenge to the Bury debate, nor was Mr. Martin authorized either to challenge or accept debate on Mr. King's behalf. When Mr. King lectured in Bury he did not challenge Mr. Bradlaugh, but was then publicly challenged by the Secularists to meet him in that hall. In lecturing in Darwen (out of which lectures his visit to Bury originated,) Mr. King did not challenge Mr. Bradlaugh, but was challenged by the Secularists, who sent up to the platform a challenge, demanding that it be read. In the *Blackburn Times*, where Mr. King's name was introduced without his consent or knowledge, he replied that though willing to meet Mr. Bradlaugh [seeing the thing was pressed upon him] he did not desire to do so. Nor has he ever desired such meeting since he knew the character of the man. The first negotiation for a debate with him was even still more clearly pushed upon Mr. King by the Secularists. They sent a deputation to his residence, admitting that they were worsted by his debate in Birmingham, with Mr. Gordon, and urging a debate with Mr. Bradlaugh. Mr. King avowed disinclination to further debate, either with Mr. Bradlaugh or any other Secularist, but they would not be thus dismissed. Finally he yielded so far as to negotiate for a debate upon their challenge, backed, as they said, by Mr. Bradlaugh's authority. Mr. Bradlaugh, however, never desired it carried out, on account of Mr. King refusing to the debaters any part of the proceeds, and, consequently, by various evasions shuffled out of the position into which he had allowed his friends to put him.

Ordinarily it matters not which side gives the challenge. But this case is an exception, because had we, at any time during the last four years, challenged Mr. Bradlaugh, we should owe a decided apology to our brethren and friends. They would have been entitled to hold us to account for subjecting them to the disgrace consequent upon our association with such a man. But, on the other hand, not being the challenger but the challenged, we owe not an apology but only an explanation. Why, then, was his challenge accepted? Because, 1.—He is the President of the *National Secularist Society*, and therefore that Society partakes of his quality when they know what he is. Many of them do not know with what they are associated, and this debate, with what must necessarily follow, will open the eyes of many and lessen the influence of more. 2.—Because, having exposed his underground work of demoralization, we were publicly denounced as a coward and a liar, and it was therefore better when the

challenge came to submit to a degradation, which could not have been proposed from our side, and thus show on which side the cowardice and falsehood are found. 3.—There were certain Bradlaugh tricks and qualities which needed exposure, and which, when fully known, would clearly disentitle him to a respectable opponent, and justify, in every direction, refusal to meet him. These the debate has fully revealed and, with other evidence carefully gathered, we intend shall be known the kingdom over. We knew what we should be subjected to by entering upon the debate, we resolved for the public good to hear it without retaliation, and we did so, declining to go down to his level, and without, so far as self was concerned, even a feeling of annoyance.

The publication of the debate is our next step, and we would not leave it undone on any account. Violent abusive declamation before an excited audience is a thing of some force, but in printed argumentation it only counts as *very poor stuff*. Throughout the debate we kept the book report in view, and, without regard to immediate effect upon the audience, when the one came in conflict with the other, the requirements of the volume decided our course. There the reader will find a discriminating outline of Christianity which Secularists (and many believers too) need access to, and which cannot be pierced by the shafts of the infidel. And there, too, will be found an unmasking of Secularism in its demoralizing aspect, which was indispensably needful.

Will the remaining two subjects be discussed? We cannot say. As we did not challenge at the outset so we cannot challenge renewal. We were there to fulfil the whole. Three weeks before, and onward, our opponent said he would not keep his engagement, though he continued to advertize himself for not less than six lectures or debates during the next week. His retirement breaks the agreement, and no future debate can take place under it. If there be more it must be under a new agreement, and a result of further challenge on his part. In that case, no doubt he will be prepared to find security, not exactly for good conduct (that would be too much to expect), but for keeping himself within the bounds of ordinary decency. It would also be highly proper that there be two securities, say in £20 each, to pay that amount to the Bury Infirmary, or some other useful charity, in the event of his being convicted, during the debate, of wilful falsehood. Those who were at the debate know how necessary is this precaution.

Ed.

THE NAZARITES OF HUNGARY.

DR. HURST, who is one of the able corps of editorial contributors for the *New York Methodist*, is furnishing that paper with letters from Germany. The following letter on the "Nazarites of Hungary," is so interesting that it is esteemed worthy of copying entire.

Frankfort-on-the-Main, Germany, June 17th, 1870.

Hungary is ripe for the pure gospel, and is one of the most inviting fields in the missionary labour. There is just now an unusual degree of religious feeling pervading the country, which, in the absence of proper religious control and guidance, is taking the form of those greater or smaller religious communities that exhibit, oftentimes, a strange mixture of truth and error, but clearly indicating the desire for the gospel shown more or less within the last few years by all slavie nations. One of the

most important of these communities is that of the Nazarites. Their history is brief, and they have grown with marvellous rapidity. Various accounts of them have appeared in the Hungarian journals, and some of these have found their way into the German language.

The best description of the Nazarites and their doctrines I have been able to meet with has just been furnished by the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*, by a writer signing himself "Professor J. H. S." It is evident that he has paid great attention to the subject, and has studied the Hungarian Nazarites in their own country. I will give you some selections from his valuable paper. Hungary comprises within its borders not only the representatives of many nationalities, but in a confessional respect, is the home of the most varied religious forms. Roman and Greek Catholics, Greek Orientalists, Armenians, Lutherans, Calvinists, and Hebrews live here in great numbers, and one can find, even in the provincial towns, four or five different religious societies. The Nazarites are a new sect; they originally appeared in small numbers here and there, but within the past eight years have gained greatly in adherents. They did not have their origin in Hungary, and the first that was heard of them there was some fifteen years ago, in the south of Hungary, which is now their chief stronghold, where a Silesian weaver, and then a shoemaker, and a tailor, were the chief preachers, or "prophets," of the new doctrine.

The Nazarites profess to derive their confession from the New Testament alone. While they acknowledge the divine origin of the Old Testament, they only regard it as an explanatory aid for the understanding of the New, or as an edifying discipline. They acknowledge the Apocrypha has some historical value, and is good for the elucidation of their doctrinal statements. God is one in essence, but three in person—Father, Son, and Spirit. He has created all things, and supports, sustains, and governs the world; the Son has redeemed man from sin by death on the cross; the Holy Spirit sanctifies and illuminates believers; man abused his freedom and sinned, and hence he has lost his innocence; holiness, and immortality, and become a prey to death. Only those enjoy the merits of Christ's death who conform to his life and doctrine. Christ is prophet, priest, and king. He died a physical death, but rose again, and as a pledge that his followers should share in his resurrection.

There are only two sacraments—Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Children should not be baptized; for it is written, "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them;" a child, moreover, cannot understand the articles of faith, and cannot, therefore, be a disciple; besides, children, according to God's word, are innocent, having no sins to wash away. Baptism can consequently only take place with propriety when the catechumen is able to testify to his faith, and can adopt and be faithful to the doctrines of Christ. When the community is satisfied with the sincerity and spiritual attainments of the applicant for membership, he is conducted by the elders of the society to some place, where he is immersed in the nearest body of water, and prayers are offered. In case of invalids or weak persons, baptism by pouring can be consummated. Every male Nazarite in good standing in his society can baptize, but a woman cannot; because the apostle Paul says they must be "silent." No money is allowed to be paid for baptism, for the apostles did that work gratuitously. No one who is not baptized can be sure of salvation, although God's infinite mercy may reach even one in that state. Baptism was ordained for believers, and the Last Supper for the sanctified, since the latter is designed to call to mind the death of Christ, and admonishes to a life like His. All who

have been baptized and are true Christians are counted among the number of the sanctified, and therefore can enjoy the Lord's Supper. In the distribution of the Lord's Supper, the Nazarites harmonize with the Reformed or Calvinists. Children are not allowed to participate in the Holy Communion, for they are supposed to be without requisite knowledge of the truth. Catechumens are called "friends," and they have no right to be present even at the distribution of the elements.

Marriage is regarded as a civil institution. As soon as betrothal has taken place, the society is publicly notified of the fact, and, if no objections are made, marriage takes place soon afterwards. No festivities are allowed to occur when the marriage is solemnized. The Nazarites, quite in harmony with their discarding of all scientific study of the Bible, did not, at the outset, send their children to school, but they have recently changed their course in this respect, and now even send their small ones. Higher studies they do not encourage in their children. Their funeral ceremonies are very simple. The deceased is clad in a plain white robe, placed in an unpainted coffin made of rough boards, and drawn on a common wagon to a cemetery. A few men attend the body, carrying with them spades with which to dig a hole; then follow relatives and a few women. No weeping takes place, for whoever passes into a blessed life should not be mourned for. The Nazarites have, strictly speaking, no holy days, and yet they respect those of other confessions by performing only light and quiet work. They do not believe that the sanctification of Sunday is enjoined in the New Testament; nevertheless, they conduct their prayer-meetings and other religious exercises on Sunday, and even on three or four other days in the week. Their places of worship are unadorned halls, in the middle of which there is a vacant space where a small unpainted table stands. About this table those are seated who take charge of the service, while the remainder of the members sit on seats without backs, men and women occupying separate parts of the hall. At first, the Hungarian Nazarites, used the Reformed hymn-book, but at present they have in use the one published first in Zurich, Switzerland, entitled *Zion's Harp*, which has been translated into Hungarian. After singing comes an extemporaneous prayer, and then an expository address by some one of the members sitting around the table. The subject of remark is almost invariably taken from the New Testament. They never say the Lord's prayer as it stands in the New Testament, but weave its separate petitions into one of their own formation, which must always be extemporaneous.

The Nazarites have no special priests; every man is a priest so far as he explains the Scriptures zealously. No one can pray and explain the Scriptures who does not receive the right to do so from the society. In life, the members are quiet, orderly and respectful to the laws, with a few exceptions. While they are charitable toward persons of other confessions, they regard those of their own faith as their chosen spiritual brethren and relatives in the Lord, and look upon all other people who may be closely related to them as merely physical kindred. They consider themselves the exclusive possessors of God's word and truth, the only perfect expositors of the Scriptures, and the only true members of Christ's kingdom; they regard all others as pursuing the fleeting perishable things of this world, rejoicing in vanities, and therefore unable in their present state, to attain eternal salvation. They are very kind to the needy, and are perfectly guiltless of the social communion which various writers have attributed to them. When they give their word to any one, they wish it to be understood that such is sufficient; hence they refuse to take the

oath, and persist in their refusal with the utmost abstinacy before the courts; neither will they serve as soldiers. They indulge in no luxury—if we exclude that of long hair. They avoid profanity, controversy, and lawsuits, and make any sacrifice to escape them. Any one who is excluded from their society is never saluted by them afterwards; they greet one another with the words: "the Lord bless you!" They call their companions in faith "brethren." They keep perfectly free from all political movements, and even take no part in the election of members of Parliament, saying they do not know which party is on the right side.

The Nazarites are strongest in South Hungary, especially in Szegedin, Temesvar, Hold-Mezo Vasarhely, and some other places. In the early part of their history they were greatly persecuted, both ecclesiastically and civilly, and the effect of this has been, as is always the case, to increase their zeal and numbers. The members are chiefly from the lower classes—simple peasants, tradesmen, and mechanics.—*Christian Review*.

MINISTRY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST—No. XI.

DURING the present year, with the exception of last month, each issue of the *B. H.* has contained an article, from the Editor's pen, under the above heading. The ground gone over is considerable, and the various ministers of the Church of Christ have been brought pretty fully before the reader. Our first article was devoted to a general introduction, and was followed by one upon Priesthood and Clergy, in which was demonstrated that there is no clerical caste or order in the Church of God, and that God's laity are the clergy of Christ. Our third chapter was devoted to the "Minister," showing the generic character of the term, and proving that no one exclusive class of officers is, in the New Testament, designated by that term. The way was thus prepared for an examination of the various ministries of the New Testament, and that examination has embraced Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Deacons, Elders, Bishops (Overseers), Pastors (Shepherds), Teachers, Exhorters, and Widow ministry. These articles have filled over forty pages, in the writing of which there was constant care to use as few words as possible. Whether the reader can or cannot accept the conclusions arrived at on the considerable number of points examined, he will certainly admit that the ground gone over is extensive, the examination somewhat thorough, and as a result, much information in a small compass. These remarks are made, not to commend the writing, nor to ask others to commend it, but solely for the purpose of urging the careful consideration of the entire theme. If the conclusions arrived at are not right, will the readers help to put forth the truth in reference thereto. As intimated at the beginning, the subject was taken in hand not so much for the purpose of setting forth our own views as for calling out examination on numerous points, the understanding of which is absolutely necessary to comfortable and successful working in the Churches. Now though, in one view of it, the entire ground is gone over, yet there are a number of practical questions growing out of points already submitted, that call for careful investigation and discriminating decision. Some of these we see, but there are, no doubt, others to which our attention has not been directed. We, then, invite questions and suggestions on the whole matter, and shall be glad to find readers going again carefully over the whole series, for the purpose of calling for or supplying what is yet lacking. Thus we trust that our monthly issues will ere long deal with the remaining practical queries.

D. K.

GONE DOWN IN THE "CAMBRIA."

The following will be read with interest, and should teach more than one lesson. Mr. Crabbs, to whom the letter is addressed, is a Baptist minister, and the writer is a disciple of Christ's, who desires in all things to observe the law of the Lord.

DEAR SIR.—In the beginning of August, I, along with my wife, passed a Lord's day in Rothesay, and attended your church. After service, we went to the hotel where we were staying, and, as we sat at tea, a young sailor lad sat down beside us and had tea also. We took notice that we had seen him in the Baptist church, and asked if he were a member; he said, no, that his ship had come into Glasgow through the week, and he had come to Rothesay with the view to be baptized, and that he waited on you after service, and asked you to baptize him, but that you would not do so. I asked him what reasons you gave for not doing so. He said, that you thought he was attaching too much importance to baptism; and he supposed he had not answered some of the questions you put to him to your satisfaction. After some further conversation, he asked you definitely if you would baptize him, when you said, no, that your conscience would not allow you. You said he had better go another voyage first; but, said he, "Perhaps I may never come back, and who is to blame?" You replied, "I'll take the responsibility." I thought this very strange procedure of a minister of a church that professed, to some extent at least, to be walking after the Apostolic model. I had a long conversation with him, and it would be an injustice to his memory to say that he was ignorant. For Scriptural knowledge and general intelligence, I have no hesitation in saying that he was far above the general class of sailors; but, as he very justly remarked, how was it possible that men in his line of life, knocking about on the sea, and deprived of the usual opportunities of mind culture, with often none of the best of companions, could have that amount of knowledge which others more favourably situated might have. I felt not a little at what I considered, your unscriptural proceedings, and, as I had to leave next morning, I gave him a letter to a pastor of a Christian church in Glasgow, who, I was sure, would take a more scriptural view of his case. I was only a few days returned home when I received a letter from him, telling me that he had been baptized the night before, and felt so happy in having an opportunity of obeying the Saviour, and confessing his sacred name. His letter was full of gratitude for what little I had done in opening up a way to that opportunity. He told me that his ship, the "Cambria," one of the New York steamers, sailed next day. When I saw in the newspapers, last week, the sad fate of the "Cambria," as she approached the Irish coast on her passage to Glasgow, I immediately wrote to ascertain if Henry Seymour was in the vessel when she was lost, when I was informed that there was every reason to believe that he went down in the ill-fated ship. I have frequently looked at your conduct in this case in the light of God's word, and the more I do so I find it a perfect contrast to the teaching and practice of the apostles. When I look at the conversions recorded in the Acts of Apostles, those on the day of pentecost, the case of Cornelius, the Ethiopian eunuch, the Philippian jailor, and many others, there was no exhortation to delay, but the action of the apostles was in accordance with the breathings of the Holy Spirit. "To-day, if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts." Now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation. I sometimes think how a quotation you made in one of your sermons that day was calculated to bewilder the mind of Henry Seymour. You quoted Peter's words in his first sermon, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." But when he comes forward and professes repentance and his belief in Jesus, wishes to be baptized in His name, and place himself under His government and guidance, you say no. I venture to say that Henry Seymour knew more of Christ than did those wicked Jews to whom Peter preached, or the Ethiopian eunuch to whom Philip expounded the Scriptures; yet, on the confession that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God, they were baptized into His name. This is the rock on which Christ himself said he would build His Church, and shall we now discard the sure foundation which God has laid in Zion, and build on the sandy foundation of mere human experience? Is the penitent sinner to be received into the Church according to some measure of knowledge, which erratic man may think he ought to possess? I have heard it stated, on the occasion of a new convert being introduced to the Church, that he had great Christian experience; I must confess that I was always inclined to be suspicious of such prodigies. We may always hope for more from a humble disciple, who may know but little, but who is willing to sit at the feet of Jesus, and learn of Him. You asked Henry Seymour why he wished to be baptized, he replied, that he did not consider himself perfect as a Christian unless he was baptized. This answer might have shown his ignorance of the improved system of Christianity of the

present day, which says it matters little whether the ordinance is attended to or not. But it showed his acquaintance with the Christianity of the New Testament, for there no one was acknowledged as one of the Holy brethren until he had been buried with Christ in baptism. One word as to your statement,—that he was attaching too much importance to baptism. I can easily see how we may attach too much importance to what man teaches and commands, but I have some difficulty in seeing how we can attach too much importance to what Christ commands. I am much afraid that at the great day, the great condemning sin, of both saints and sinners, will be the attaching too little importance to what has been commanded by the great King. In reference to the question "Why do you wish to be baptized?" you said, that when you asked old experienced Christians for what they were baptized, they stumbled at the question and could not answer. I do not wonder at it; my experience is that the design of baptism is never taught in Baptist churches. Although brought up in the persuasion, I never yet heard a discourse on the design of baptism; I have heard no end of them on the mode and symbolic representation of the ordinance, but the most important phase of the institution, viz., its design, I suppose is seldom or never touched. The institution of the Lord's Supper has a symbolic meaning, it shews forth the broken body and shed blood of Christ; but it has a design, and that is, to keep his death in remembrance: these are clearly taught in all Baptist churches. Why should not the design of baptism be as clearly and scripturally taught? If it were, I am sure it would do much to clear away the doubts and darknesses which becloud the minds of many good people, and a painful incident such as that to which I have had occasion to refer, could scarcely have happened. May it teach us all the necessity of sticking closer to apostolic practices and examples; it is only when we do so, that we shall find our feet upon a rock that shall never be moved; but if we prefer the shifting sands of human expediency, Christ will be dishonoured, and wreck and ruin to the souls of men will be the result. May the name of Jesus, which Henry Seymour believed and confessed, have proved a refuge to him in his last and trying moments; and, ere the gurgling waves had succeeded in separating the mortal from the immortal, may he have been enabled, like Stephen of old, to commend his spirit to the Lord Jesus. Hoping you will excuse the liberty I have taken in writing this lengthy letter,—I am, yours in the Truth,—WILLIAM DICK.

And now what shall we say? Not much, for the lessons are obvious. Let sinners give themselves to Christ, while it is possible so to do, and let no man obstruct.

D. K.

Literature.

WHAT CAN SECULARISM DO FOR MAN THAT CHRISTIANITY CANNOT ?

A SERMON PREACHED IN BURY, BY THE REV. W. R. SUNMAN; WITH
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE KING AND BRADLAUGH DISCUSSION.—
Fletcher, Bury.

THE Preacher commenced by saying that "The discussion has collapsed! And the fault does not lie with the Christian advocate." He adds that "The Secularist champion has carried out the main principle of his moral code, the greatest good for the greatest number, and as that number is, in the reckoning of many people, "number one," he has retired on account of his health; although it is not in so deplorable a state as to compel him to relinquish *all* his other engagements." Mr. Sunman then proceeds to intimate that no Christian can be sorry that the debate has come to a premature end, and the reason he assigns is, that it "could not be otherwise than painful to listen to such perversions of fact, such fierce diatribes, and such audacious blasphemy of things that even the very savage will treat with reverence." And certainly Mr. Bradlaugh's performance deserves the description thus given. On the other hand, Mr. Sunman considers that Secular-

ists can only be glad to escape from the remaining portion of the debate. He says, "Nor should I imagine that any Secularist can be sorry, for if he be sincere in his belief, and possess a healthy and unbiassed mind, his faith must have had a most severe shaking."

But before the debate took place, as Mr. Sunman reminds us, he expressed himself as to the unwisdom and unusefulness of such debates—that is, of course, not of this particular debate, but of debates with Infidels generally. Now here we cannot agree with our friend. When we know instances in which the Infidel lecturer, after closing such a debate, resolved never more to lecture in favour of Infidelity; when we know that men are now preaching Christ who have been started from a life of public opposition to Christianity by means of platform debates in which they took part—we dare not, when a debate is advertized, characterize it as necessarily unwise and useless. We could give Mr. Sunman facts which we think would induce *him* to enter upon such a debate did he know that similar results would follow. But let us not be understood as meaning that such debates as that under notice are frequently desirable. We hold that no minister in or near Bury is now under any obligation to meet Mr. Bradlaugh—that it would be unwise to do so. But why? Because the late discussion releases them from all demands that Secularists can put in. They have now a satisfactory answer. They can say "Your champion is an unprincipled blasphemer whom no gentleman, knowing what he is, could possibly consent to meet without unjustifiable degradation." But till that had been demonstrated we do not see that it would have been satisfactory for those ministers to turn their weapons upon Secularism, shielded by their pulpits and refuse all demands to come out and test the strength of their reasons. One

part of Mr. King's purpose was to make it impossible for Secularists to challenge Christians to meet Mr. Bradlaugh in debate without entitling themselves to a scornful refusal; and we are satisfied that the full report of the debate will do its work in that direction, in connection with intended subsequent issues from the press.

We commend Mr. Sunman's sermon; the circulation of such productions will do good. And in reference to the good resulting from its publication we shall place some little to the account of the debate, seeing that the sermon, as it is, would not have been possible had not the debate taken place.

Mr. Sunman tells us what he means by Christianity.

"And first let us define our terms, that we may understand perfectly what we are doing. What is Christianity? It is not Judaism. Nor is it any development of Judaism. The religion of the Jews was the predecessor of Christianity, and, as such, it affords many brilliant proofs of the Divine origin of Christianity, such as prophecy, typical ordinances, and fore-shadowings of the Messiah; but that does not make it into Christianity, nor even into the foundation upon which Christianity is built. At the same time, we do not depreciate Judaism; for much as sceptics may profess horror at it as a dispensation from God, I do not question that its result upon the Jews was infinitely more productive of the greatest happiness to the greatest number than would have been the case with their much vaunted Secularism.

Nor is Christianity any development of Denominationalism. It is not Roman Catholicism, nor Episcopalianism, nor Congregationalism, nor Methodism. Christianity is more or less in all of them, but they are not it. What then is Christianity? It is the system of doctrines and precepts derivable by fair and legitimate interpretation from the teachings of Jesus Christ and His Apostles, as recorded in the New Testament.

The insolence of Secularism in appropriating to itself work done by believers is very well put.

"But the high priest of Secularism, with the most audacious effrontery—an effrontery, in fact, which out-herods Herod—takes the results of Christianity and ascribes them to

Secularism. Hear O heavens, and give ear O earth! Charles Bradlaugh says, 'One thing which Secularism had done for the world, which Christianity could not, was that it had educated the mass of the people, and was educating them day by day.' With unfeigned astonishment I ask, who preserved education and learning during the dark ages, when the academies of Athens died out, and the civilization of Rome crumbled away, and might was the only rule of right? Did Secularism do it? No, but Christianity did! Who have done all that has heretofore been done in the shape of national education in this country? Have Secularists? No, but Christians have! Who reared the Universities, some of which are now venerable with the lapse of many centuries—Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, Dublin, and London? Did Secularists? No, but Christians did! Who fill their professor's chairs? Do Secularists? No, but Christians do! Who are now educating the boys and girls of this country in denominational schools, in British schools, and in charity schools? Are the Secularists? No, but Christians are! In fact, the Sunday schools of this country have done more during the last 80 years towards the real education of the people, than Secularism has done since the Creation, or will do before the Millennium. And I ask yet further, Who carried the recent Education Bill through Parliament? Did the Secularists? O, no! In fact, if there had been no such thing in the world as Secularism, we should have obtained a better bill, for a multitude of people confounded secular education with Secularistic education, and the two things are widely different. On the other hand, where are the Secularistic universities, grammar schools, common schools, and the vast machinery with which they have been, and are, educating the mass of the people day by day? And echo answers—where?

His next statement is no less devoid of truth. He says that Secularism procured freedom for the slave, whereas Christianity could not do so, because it does not repeal Old Testament slavery. Now, I am not going to defend Old Testament slavery, although I have an idea that even that state was to be preferred to some Secularistic freedom. But I do affirm that slavery is repealed in the New Testament. Read the Epistle of Paul to Philemon. Does not Paul, in love, command Philemon, as a

christian, to receive his christian slave no longer as a servant, but as a brother beloved; and if he received him thus, could he any longer regard him, or keep him, or treat him as a slave? But Mr. Bradlaugh would have us believe that it was not till 1792, when infidel, anarchic France had already freed her slaves, that Christianity began to think about the matter. But this is not true. In 1512, Cardinal Ximenes, a christian, protested against the importation of negroes into America, but the secular spirit, which saw profit in their blood, trampled his protest under foot. In 1754, the Society of Friends, in America, passed a resolution that they would neither keep slaves, nor use in any way the produce of slave labour; and they consistently and persistently advocated emancipation till it was accomplished. In 1787 an anti-slavery society was formed in London, amongst the members of which were Dellwynn, Clarkson, and Granville Sharp. In 1788 a committee of enquiry into the action of the slave trade, was appointed by Parliament; and in 1792, Dundas's resolutions for the abolition of the slave-trade were carried in the House of Commons. All this was before the French Revolution freed its slaves. But there the matter rested. And why? Why, because the Revolution, while with one hand it gave liberty to the slave, with the other it slew two millions and a half of Frenchmen! And christian England, horrified with the fierce excesses of infidelity, for it was infidelity that gave the "reign of terror" to history, stayed her hand even from emancipation, in very fear of all that went under the name of liberty. Another instance of the retarding influence of Secularism, upon the good works wrought by Christianity. But, I ask, Who freed the slave? Did Secularists do it? No; the men associated with that humane enterprise, were Christian men—Wilberforce, Clarkson, Buxton, Macaulay, Sharp, Dellwynn, and last but not least, Knibb, the humble and holy missionary of the cross, who one day stood upon Exeter Hall platform, and exhibiting some slave fetters, in a sacred frenzy, dashed them on the floor, exclaiming, 'I'll die, but I'll see them free.' So that in this case also, we wrest the spoil of Christianity from the hands of Secularism, which has not won it, and therefore does not deserve it."

Space forbids further notice. May the preacher accomplish much in his day and generation.

POPULAR LECTURES ON THE EVIDENCES OF RELIGION.

By B. H. COWPER (UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE SOCIETY): Book Society, London.

THIS useful volume contains ten Lectures, delivered in Shoreditch, London, to an aggregate of not less than 1,800 persons, intended as a

counter movement to the lectures in the London Secularist New Hall of Science. Mr. Cowper is a gentleman and a scholar. The lectures are put into the plainest terms to meet the need of his vast audience of working men. We cannot speak of the book as fully adapted to meet the prevailing want, but it is an acceptable contribution in the right direction, and well worth circulating among the many. In the lecture on the New Testament we read—

“As I have referred to two examples I must refer to a third, in order to be impartial, as illustrating those who believe too much; and I quote a man who is—I will not say canonized, but almost deified—Thomas Paine. What does Thomas Paine say? He says ‘there was no such book as the New Testament until 300 years after the time at which Christ lived.’ I find that in the second part of the Age of Reason, and he repeats that statement five times in the course of the Age of Reason. Hone, who repented of it, repeated a similar story; Robert Taylor repeated it; Robert Cooper repeated it; and many men of the same class have propagated the same falsehood. Oh, infidel men of London, who can believe so much! They say that a man named Pappus, who, as far as I can discover, lived about the time of Martin Luther, published a book which gave an account of certain councils, and among them of the Council of Nice, in 325. Pappus says that ‘the fathers of the first Ecumenical Council wished to decide as to the books of the New Testament; and they brought forth all the books alleged to be inspired by God, and put them in front of the table, and those that were inspired jumped on the table, and those that were uninspired crept under the table.’ And your infidel swallows this story without any difficulty. Truly, this is straining at a gnat and swallowing the camel!

I say again you must not believe *too little*; there are men who believe too little, and I will give examples of them. I have here a publication, dated March 27th, 1870, in which christians are described thus: ‘They shelter themselves behind their theological theories; they shelter themselves behind their bible; and shelter themselves behind their Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Paul; and unless you show them that this evidence is false, and this christianity is bolstered up by fraud and forgery—unless you tear the book to pieces, you cannot compel them to give way, as we have compelled them in a thousand directions.’ That is believing too little—that proceeds

from the negation of faith; it proceeds from a spirit which is inclined to drive at some object in the distance, irrespective of all difficulties and of all claims that may be urged in favour of some other course.

Here is another who believes too little; one who wrote a book, in order to prove that the gospel of St. John did not appear until the middle of the second century—150 years after Christ. He gave some very plausible arguments, and I read the book and found that he believed too little, that he overlooked most conclusive facts for the higher antiquity of St. John's Gospel, such as this, that one of the more prominent of the sects of heretics based their system mainly on the Gospel of St. John. Now this man believes too little. And I may say of a gentleman, of whom I would never speak harshly—I refer to M. Renan, the critic, who has written the histories of Jesus, of Paul, and of the Apostles, and many other books, in a style not often surpassed, flowing and beautiful, and yet exhibiting an amount of patient thought and of correct thinking, and great learning and research, which some of our wisest and most eminent scholars might envy—he believes too little. He says, ‘He thinks that there is some doubt respecting the authorship of the Gospel of St. John.’ But he correctly believes, carried away by the force of that evidence, that the Gospel of St. John must have been written about the time to which Christianity almost with one voice has referred it. I read the following:—‘I shall close (the second volume) about the year 100, when the last friends of Jesus are dead, and when *all the books of the New Testament* are almost fixed in the form in which we now read them.’ This language is strong enough, and Renan, if he has not solved the matter to the satisfaction of all English readers, nevertheless admits that before the year 100 all the books of the New Testament were fixed in the form in which we read them now. He thinks that the Epistles of St. Paul were not really collected into one volume until A.D. 150 and 160; but that does not go far in favour of the infidel, for he has admitted that they were written long before, whether collected or not. He asserts that Justin Martyr was not acquainted with St. Paul's Epistles; but when I have read the pages of Justin Martyr, which reflect so distinctly the phraseology of St. Paul, I cannot doubt for a moment whether Justin Martyr used the Epistles of St. Paul.

After the concessions of M. Renan we shall scarcely be told that we have no evidence. Our sceptical friends may think we believe too much, and we may think that they believe too little; but I doubt whether they will say we have no evidence. If they do, as many times as they have said it we tell them

it is not true; and if it were true, it would not disprove the antiquity, the genuineness, and the authenticity of the New Testament. Besides, there is no evidence against the book; to which the answer universally is—"No evidence against it! how can there be? When Celsus and Porphyry wrote against it you burnt their writings, and thus you burnt their evidence." You admit this, do you? So be it. Then, I might say, when christian men wrote the evidence of the book, your unbelievers burnt their writings, destroyed their documents, put out of existence the evidence which they had put on record; so that at least we gain as much as we lose. But the fact is this, that we have ancient evidence, far more than I can bring before you now. We have evidence even from those who rejected the gospel of Jesus Christ."

A few pages further on we read—"But what particular evidence have we that the early Christians generally accepted so many books as has been alleged? The evidence is very comprehensive. I will read a few names to give you an idea of the 'cloud of witnesses,' and the classification of those witnesses. The first group

begins with Origen, 220 years after Christ. He was born in Egypt about A.D. 185. In this we have Origen; Hippolytus; Tertullian; Clement of Alexandria; Irenæus; the canon of Muratori (an ancient Latin list of the books of the New Testament, written about A.D. 170); the Syriac translations, written at a still earlier date; the Latin, made at about the same time; the Harmonies of Tatian and Theophilus, and others.

In a second series we have the names of Athenagoras, Dionysius, Hegesippus, Melito, Claudius Appollinaris, Polycrates, the Epistle of Vienne and Lyons (written at the time of a terrible persecution of the churches in the south of France), and Serapion.

In a third series we have Justin Martyr, Ignatius, the Epistle to Diognetus, Polycarp, Hermas, Papias, Barnabas, and Clement of Rome."

The reader might do a worse thing than that of placing the book in the Sunday School or Church library, or sending it as a present to any earnest enquirer.

Intelligence of Churches, &c.

EVANGELIZATION OF ITALY.

FATHER GAVAZZI, in his present tour through the kingdom, has recently lifted up his voice in Birmingham, stating very interesting and important facts bearing upon the Evangelization of Italy.

Speaking of freedom of worship in that country, he tells us, that in 1847, there was not a single free religious worshipper in Italy; while from 1860, dating from the wonderful achievements of Garibaldi the liberator, and largely ascribable to them, remarkable progress has been made towards the religious unification of the Italian people upon the platform of a free and unsectarian christianity, so that now, in 1870, there are no less than one hundred churches with an average attendance of 10,000 communicants, and about 30,000 hearers of the word.

The reading and circulation of the Bible has also kept pace with the foregoing progress. In 1847, so great and iniquitous was the power of Romanism, that no one among the common people dared to read the Bible publicly upon pain of hard labour in chains. But with political the Italians are also gaining religious liberty. From 1860 the

Bible has been read and circulated almost everywhere, to the grief of the priests of Rome, 25,000 to 30,000 copies being sold annually. Altogether there are now upwards of 300,000 copies of the Bible in its pure form in free circulation among the Italians.

The church in Italy is divided into two great sections, the Waldensian and the Free Church. The first, as Gavazzi says—drawing his simile from "Jacob's ladder," descending to us from the days of the apostles, and the latter ascending from our time to the apostles' days; both having the same grand purpose in view: the conversion of Italy to the pure religion of Christ as it is found in the word of God. One or more churches of the kind mentioned may be found in every large town in the country—Rome excepted.

The Father thinks that the days of Roman Catholicism upon its present basis are numbered, and gives as a token of its decline, the general want of reverence shown for the "Church" by the people of all classes. It is now, because of its worldly propensities, sale of indulgences, &c.

known and publicly spoken of as—"THE SHOP."

He strongly condemns denominational preaching as it has been practised for some time by religious bodies from our country, and implores the people of England when striving for the spiritual emancipation of Italy to leave their sects and parties at home and preach in his country the gospel of Christ in all its unsectarian spirit. Plymouth Brethrenism, while admired for the individual piety of its members, were by him, as a body, denounced as tending to anarchy, disorder, total destruction of church government, and as fatal to the Evangelization of Italy. Sectarian preaching, he avers, appears now, however, to be almost among the things of the past.

As no Pope, it is said, can live longer

than twenty-five years, or he officially outlives Peter the apostle, Gavazzi is in great hopes that the prophecy will prove true, and when the Pope dies half a year hence, and Victor Emmanuel is able from his head quarters in Rome to remodel the Italian constitution and thus remove all religious disabilities, then, like Paul of old, the Father means, in addition to his proclamation of the truth throughout Italy, to go up, and in the strength of God, "to preach the gospel to them who are at Rome also."

So far as he keeps by his programme of the "Bible and the Bible alone" for the spiritual unification and conversion of Italy, we are sure that all true lovers of Christ will say from the heart "God Speed."
J. A.

BIRMINGHAM—SUMMER LANE CHURCH.

OF the three churches of the Apostolic order planted in Birmingham, only one (the second) has deemed it well to keep the anniversary of the opening of its meeting place. The church in Geach Street and Summer Lane has done so, and looks for a social meeting somewhere about the 5th of November. This year the meeting was particularly interesting, from the presence of many brethren from the other two churches, and a considerable number of non-members, who seemed to enjoy the addresses after the tea, even more than the good things provided for the refreshment of the body. Addresses were delivered on the occasion by the President (D. King), E. Fraser, John Johnson, J. Bonell, T. Jones, and J. Adam. The following facts are from the Report read by G. Lloyd:—

"The first meeting of those who formed this church was held in the schoolroom below, on November 2, 1865, when there were present ten brethren, who formerly worshipped in this place as immersed believers in Christ, and previously in the old asylum on the opposite side of the road, and fifty-two brethren who were up to that time members of the church of Christ in Charles Henry Street, Birmingham.

"This meeting was held for the purpose of making mutual resolutions and a formal declaration of our then future intentions to contend together for the 'faith once delivered to the saints.' The following is the declaration then resolved upon unanimously:—

"That we, being immersed believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, acknowledging His authority in all things; and in the perfection of the faith and polity delivered by Him, through the Apostles; and some of us having been dismissed from the church in Charles Henry Street for the purpose of forming another church here, and others of us having till now met for worship in this place; we do now declare ourselves the

"Church of Christ" in this place. And we do avow our duty and determination to observe the ordinances of Christianity, worship according to the Apostolic order, make known the Gospel and way of salvation; and to be, to do, and to suffer, whatsoever Holy Scriptures require; and that our standing and action as a church date from this day, and that a proper record of the transactions of this meeting, and the future acts of the church be kept."

"In addition to the labours of brother King since the formation of this church, considerable assistance has been rendered in the preaching of the gospel by brethren Thomas Johnson, John Strang, John Carn-duff, and others, in the former part of the time, but in the latter part by brethren Thomas Johnson, William Johnson, J. Adam, and others, in addition to brother King.

"Although the results in conversions to Christ have not at any time been very great, still we have much cause for gratitude in view of the steady but permanent increase in our numbers, attesting as it does to the native 'power of the gospel in continually winning some souls to Christ.'

"During the five years, 94 have been immersed upon confession of their faith. Comparing our present number with the number five years ago, it stands thus:—In 1865, 62 members; in 1870, 140 members; being a net increase of 78, which is 16 more than double the number in 1865, although, that in the exercise of discipline, a number have been excluded for disorderly walking.

"During the five years, we have had to mourn, but with a sure and certain hope, the removal by the hand of death of seven brothers and sisters. 'Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord,' and 'their memory is blessed.'"

We observe with pleasure that this church thus reports so considerable an increase,

and the more so when we remember that between 30 and 40 have been transferred to other churches or emigrated to distant lands, carrying with them the influence of the religion they profess. These statements of course refer not to Birmingham as a whole, but to this one only of the three churches.

The addresses were, without exception, what we think they should be on such occasions. They told of the precious things of God; of our faith, and hope, and joy; and they made the faces of the hearers glad, but there was not in any instance an approach to frivolity. We have heard of some cases where, in connection with chapel tea-meetings, they could not keep above dull care without dressing up some accommodating members to say or do something "in character," to appear as a ploughman or some other rustic; everything of the sort being exceedingly *out of character* with the place and profession of those who take part therein. We believe that the people on this occasion went away not *amused*, but better in soul and spirit, and gladdened by the wine and oil of the higher life. D. K.

Obituary.

It has devolved upon me to chronicle the passing away of one of the world's poor—one of God's nobility: MARIA MARSHALL, united with the church in Manchester October 7, 1855, and after a season of severe suffering fell asleep in Jesus October 8, 1870, aged 40. For many years she was the stay and comfort of her poor blind Aunt, Mary Smith, who died a short time since, who, to add a few shillings weekly to their slender wages, undertook, what in Lancashire is called "knocking up." This required her to rise, both winter and summer, about four o'clock, and, needing a guide, Maria accompanied her, thus adding to her own long day's toil as a mill hand. Though extremely poor they did not present themselves empty-handed at the Lord's Table, where, through all weathers, though living at a considerable distance, their seat was seldom vacant. And in every extra effort of the church to spread the gospel and to extend the Redeemer's kingdom they deemed it a privilege to throw in their mite, not shrinking from the rigid self-denial consequent upon their so doing. Their home was one of such order and cleanliness as might well shame some of our sisters who are in the possession of strong hands and bright eyes; though the labour thereof devolved upon the blind woman, while the other toiled at the mill. Memory recalls many sweet moments spent by their bright fireside, reading and speaking of Jesus. Neither poverty nor pain disquieted them; their hope was bright, their faith was firm, they rested confidently on God's promises. By the removal of these humble disciples the church in Manchester

has lost two of its rich ornaments, two of its bright examples. We shall clasp hands with them no more on earth, but may it be ours to rank near them in the everlasting kingdom of God and of His Christ!

LOUISE KING.

HARRY FORESTER TOWLSON, aged 30, fell asleep in Jesus, October 30. About three years ago he was transferred from the church in Nottingham to that in Leicester, and has rendered good service to the church by his consistent walk, and earnest efforts for its edification, having filled the office of deacon faithfully, so far as bodily weakness would permit. A sister, wife, and young son are left to feel his loss.

ISAAC PATTINSON, of Whitehaven, departed this life October 1, aged 76 years.

ELIZABETH BROWN, wife of W. Brown, sen., of Whitehaven, fell asleep in Jesus, October 8, aged 64. A disciple of many years' standing, well known and well beloved; her hospitality and active kindness, together with her regular attendance to the requirements of the Lord, are well worthy of world wide imitation. She suffered long and severely, but her end was peace.

JANE THOMAS, daughter of Oliver and Mary Thomas, of Rhosymedre, fell asleep October 20, aged 35. She was immersed at the early age of 15 and showed forth for 20 years the consistent life of a devout christian. Suffering from that most painful disease, cancer, for two years, she bore intense pain with patience. Her memory will long be cherished by the church at Cefn Mawr, of which she was a beloved member.

Barker Gate, Nottingham.—We have it verified that death hath passed on all, by the removal to their rest of four sisters, from our midst.

September 20.—MARIAN BRADBURY, aged 26, was attacked by fever in the discharge of loving duties to others, and that just on the eve of her marriage; but she is gone to prepare to sit down at the marriage supper of the Lamb.

October 11.—ELIZABETH BENTLEY, in her 84th year. This sister filled up her place and obligations to within a very short time of her death, and fully realized the truth and its promises in health and on her bed of pain.

October 17.—ELLEN KNOWLES, aged 17. This young sister was led to believe and obey the truth on the 18th of September last. Being of a delicate constitution she was attacked with fever, which proved fatal.

October 26th.—RUTH QUAIL, after a very long affliction, which she knew and stated was for her good and God's glory; she entered into rest with a good hope, aged 20 years. E.M.

